THE

HISTORY OF ENGLAND

VOL. VI

QUEEN ELIZABETH

THE

History of England

FROM THE FIRST INVASION BY THE ROMANS
TO THE ACCESSION OF KING
GEORGE THE FIFTH

WITHDRAWN

BY

JOHN LINGARD, D.D.

AND

HILAIRE BELLOC, B.A.

With an Introduction

BY

HIS EMINENCE
JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES

942
L755h
v. 6

EX LIBRIS PROVINCIALE
PRO STUDIO THEOL.
SS. COR. JESU.

New York
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY
OF AMERICA
1912

WITHDRAWN

CONTENTS

OF

THE SIXTH VOLUME.

CHAPTER I.

ELIZABETH.

ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH—ABOLITION OF THE CATHOLIC WORSHIP—PEACE WITH FRANCE AND SCOTLAND—WAR OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION—INTRIGUES OF CECIL WITH THE REFORMERS—SIEGE OF LEITH—TREATIES OF PEACE—RETURN OF MARY STUART TO SCOTLAND—SUITORS OF ELIZABETH.

Accession of Elizabeth 1
Her answer to the council ... 2
Her chief advisers 3
Her accession notified to foreign courts 4
Deliberation respecting religion 6
The plan proposed 7
Resistance of the Catholic prelates 8
Queen is crowned 9
Opening of parliament 10
Address of the Commons ... 11
Act in favour of the queen ... 12
Ecclesiastical enactments ... 13
Opposition of the clergy ... 14
They are expelled 16
Consecration of new prelates ... 17
Peace with France 20
Peace with Scotland 23
Scottish reformation 25
Marriage of Mary Stuart ... 27
Contest of reformers with the regent 29
Open war 31
Elizabeth supports the congregation 33
Arran escapes from France ... 35
The congregation in possession of Edinburgh 36
Elizabeth aids the insurgents ... 39
They are driven from the capital 41
Aid of a fleet and army ... 42
The English fleet in the Frith ... 44
False account of its object ... 45
Attempt to excite a civil war in France 46
Treaty with the Scots 48
Declaration against the house of Guise 49
Failure of the siege of Leith ... 50
Negotiation ... ... *ib.*
Treaty between Mary and the Scots 52
Between Mary and Elizabeth ... 53
Convention in Scotland ... 54
Death of Francis II. 56
Mary refuses to ratify the treaty 57
She returns to Scotland ... 60
Elizabeth's suitors 62
Philip ... ... *ib.*
Charles of Austria 63
Eric of Sweden 65
Adolphus of Holstein 66
The earl of Arran ... ... *ib.*
Her own subjects 67
Robert Dudley 68

CHAPTER II.

ELIZABETH AIDS THE FRENCH HUGUENOTS—PROCEEDINGS OF PARLIAMENT—PENAL STATUTES AGAINST CATHOLICS—THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES—PACIFICATION IN FRANCE—RETREAT OF THE ENGLISH—ELIZABETH PROPOSES TO MARY STUART TO MARRY DUDLEY—SHE MARRIES DARNLEY—ELIZABETH FIXES ON THE ARCHDUKE CHARLES FOR HER HUSBAND—REJECTS HIM—ASSASSINATION OF RICCIO—BIRTH OF JAMES—PETITION TO ELIZABETH TO MARRY—HER UNINTELLIGIBLE ANSWER—ASSASSINATION OF DARNLEY—TRIAL AND ACQUITTAL OF BOTHWELL—MARRIAGE OF MARY WITH BOTHWELL.

Civil and rel gious war in France 73
Elizabeth aids the insurgents ... 75
Her declaration 76
Loss of Rouen 78
Battle of Dreux 79
Proceedings of parliament ... *ib.*
Conspiracy of the Poles ... 80
Penal statutes against the Catholics 81
Proceedings of convocation ... 84
Pacification of parties in France 86
Surrender of Havre 87
Disgraceful peace 89
Subjects of dissension between Elizabeth and Mary 91
Proceedings of the English parliament 93
Attempt to prevent the marriage of Mary 96
Elizabeth offers her Dudley ... 98
She prefers Darnley 100
Acquaints Elizabeth with her intention 102
Who urges the Scots to oppose the match 103
The raid of Perth 105
Mary is married 107
She drives the insurgents out of the realm 111
Elizabeth determines to marry 112
Hesitates about the choice of a husband 113
Prefers the archduke Charles ... 114
And at last repents of her choice 117
Dissension between Mary and Darnley 117
Account of Riccio 118
Bonds between Darnley and the exiles 120
A public fast 122
Murder of Riccio 123
Mary is imprisoned 124
She escapes ... ... *ib.*
Is delivered of a son 126
Public discontent 127
Elizabeth calls a parliament ... *ib.*
Is displeased with the proceedings 128
Petition of the Lords ... ... *ib.*
Strong language in the Commons 129
Queen's answer to their petition 130
Discontent of Darnley 131
Mary's illness 133
Conspiracy at Craigmillar ... 134
Bond to murder Darnley ... 136
Pardon of the exiles 137
Consultation about the murder 138
Reconciliation of the king and queen ... ... *ib.*
Darnley is murdered 140
Mourning of Mary 141
Bothwell accused of the murder 142
He is tried and acquitted ... 145
Proceedings of the Scottish parliament 146
A new bond to Bothwell ... 147
He seizes the person of the queen 148
She consents to marry him ... 151

CHAPTER III.

CAPTURE, IMPRISONMENT, AND RESIGNATION OF MARY STUART—SHE SEEKS AN ASYLUM IN ENGLAND—CONFERENCES AT YORK AND WESTMINSTER—PROJECT OF MARRIAGE BETWEEN MARY AND THE DUKE OF NORFOLK—HE IS IMPRISONED—REBELLION IN THE NORTH—BULL OF EXCOMMUNICATION AND DEPOSITION AGAINST THE QUEEN—TROUBLES IN THE NETHERLANDS—AND IN FRANCE.

Association to oppose Bothwell... 153
Mary surrendered to the confederates 155
She is imprisoned in Lochlevin... 156
Resigns her crown 160
Is visited by Murray 163
Her letters first brought forward 168
Is charged with adultery and murder 169
Mary attempts to escape ... 170
She succeeds ... ... *ib.*
And flees into England 171
Plans of the English cabinet ... 174
Mary's complaints 177
Consents to a conference at York 179
It is opened 180
Intrigues of the different parties 181
The conference is transferred to Westminster 184
Murray charges the queen with the murder 186
Produces the letters and contracts 187
Mary retorts the charge ... 190
The conference is dissolved ... 191
Mary claims the victory ... 193
Project of marriage between Mary and Norfolk 194
Party against Cecil 195
Marriage proposed to Mary ... 198
The secret betrayed 199
Murray opposes the plan ... 200
Elizabeth is irritated 201
Norfolk is sent to the Tower ... 203
Conspiracy to liberate Mary ... 204
Earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland in arms ... 208
Proclamation in favour of Catholic worship 210
The insurgents retreat 212
They solicit the aid of the Catholic lords ... ... *ib.*
They flee into Scotland 216
Executions 217
Queen's proclamation 218
Rising of Leonard Dacres ... *ib.*
Inroads across the borders ... 220
Excommunication of Elizabeth... 223
Daring action of Felton ... 224
Elizabeth seeks its revocation ... 225
Rebellion in the Netherlands ... 226
New civil war in France ... 229
Seizure of money going to the duke of Alva 231
Support given to French Huguenots 233

CHAPTER IV.

CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING THE SCOTTISH QUEEN — PENAL LAWS AGAINST THE CATHOLICS — PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE PURITANS — DETECTION OF A CONSPIRACY — TRIAL AND EXECUTION OF THE DUKE OF NORFOLK—CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE—CIVIL WAR IN THE NETHERLANDS—THE DUKE OF ANJOU ACCEPTS THE SOVEREIGNTY — VISITS THE QUEEN OF ENGLAND —THEY PROMISE TO MARRY EACH OTHER — HIS DEPARTURE AND DEATH—AFFAIRS OF IRELAND.

Consultations respecting Mary Stuart 236
First plan, to put her to death ... 237
Second, to provide against her claims ... ... *ib.*
Negotiation with her 239
Unexpectedly interrupted ... 241
Acts of parliament 243
Against the Catholics ... ... *ib.*
The queen's antipathy to the Puritans 245
The High Commission court ... 246

Separation from the established church 247
Opposition in parliament ... 248
Members reprimanded by the queen 249
Negotiation of marriage with Anjou 250
Treaty of alliance with France ... 252
Discontent at home ... ... *ib.*
Detection of a conspiracy ... 257
Its object 261
Mission of Ridolfi 263
Examination of prisoners ... 264
Duke of Norfolk condemned ... 267
Queen hesitates to sign the warrant 271
Executed at the petition of parliament 272
Queen refuses to put Mary to death 273
Whose party dwindles away in Scotland 275
Execution of the earl of Northumberland 277
Negotiation of marriage with Alençon 278
Massacre of the Protestants at Paris 279
Apology made by Charles ... 281
Elizabeth offers to deliver up Mary 282
But the regent dies 284
Morton succeeds 285
And reduces the castle of Edinburgh 286
Siege of La Rochelle 287
League of the French Protestants 288
Succession of Henry 289
League of the French Catholics 291
Discontent in the Netherlands ... *ib.*
Origin of Belgian independence 292
The Prince of Orange made stadtholder 293
Reconciliation between Elizabeth and Alva 294
She refuses the offer of the States 295
But at last consents to give them aid 299
The States make an offer to the duke of Anjou 300
He sends Simier with proposals of marriage to the queen ... 302
A preliminary treaty of marriage is concluded 304
Anjou accepts the sovereignty of the provinces 305
A French embassy respecting the marriage 306
Anjou is contracted to Elizabeth 308
She recalls her consent 309
Punishes libellers against him ... 311
Reluctantly allows him to depart 312
His subsequent conduct and death 313
Assassination of the prince of Orange... 314
State of Ireland ... ... *ib.*
Fruitless attempt to colonize it with Englishmen 316
Adventures of the earl of Essex 317
Foreign invasions 319
Death of Desmond 322

CHAPTER V

PERSECUTION OF THE PURITANS—THE CATHOLICS—AND THE ANABAPTISTS—REVOLUTION IN SCOTLAND—MORTON IS EXECUTED FOR THE MURDER OF DARNLEY—PLOTS FOR THE LIBERATION OF MARY STUART—EXECUTION OF ARDEN AND THROCKMORTON—PENAL ENACTMENTS—HISTORY OF PARRY—HIS EXECUTION—FLIGHT AND CONDEMNATION OF THE EARL OF ARUNDEL—TRAGICAL DEATH OF THE EARL OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

Persecution of the Puritans ... 323
Zeal of Archbishop Parker ... 325
Grindall 326
Whitgift ... ... *ib.*
Execution of Thacker and Copping 327
Persecution of the Catholics ... 328
Penalties to which they were subject 329
Establishment of seminaries ... 331
Execution of Mayne ... ... *ib.*
And of others 332
Arrival of Persons and Campian 334
New penal enactments 335
Letter and challenge of Campian 336
Sufferings of the lay Catholics ... *ib.*
Campian is taken and tortured ... 338
Is secretly introduced to the queen 339
Arraigned with twelve others ... 340
And condemned 341
He and most of his companions suffer ... ... *ib.*

Persecution of the Anabaptists... 344
Sufferings of Mary Stuart ... 346
Disquietude of Elizabeth ... *ib.*
Revolution in Scotland... ... 348
James asserts his independence... 349
Arrests Morton for the murder of his father 350
Morton is convicted and executed 352
New deliberations respecting Mary 353
Intrigues in favour of Mary ... 355
The raid of Ruthven 357
Letter from Mary to Elizabeth... 358
Walsingham sent to Scotland ... 360
A new plan for the liberation of Mary 362
Elizabeth alarmed by the report of conspiracies against her ... 364
That of Arden 365
Of Paget and Throckmorton ... 366
James overcomes his opponents 369
Negotiation for the freedom of Mary 370
Rendered useless by the perfidy of Gray 372
Association against the enemies of Elizabeth confirmed by statute 373
Motions for further reformation 375
Penal statutes against Catholics *ib.*
Opposed by Parry 376
History of Parry 377
His intrigue with Neville ... 379
He is executed for treason ... 381
The Catholics petition in vain ... 382
Terrors of the Scottish queen ... 383
Her son abandons her cause ... 384
Discontent of the earl of Arundel 387
He attempts to leave the kingdom 388
Is taken 389
And condemned in the Star-chamber 390
Death of the earl of Northumberland 391

CHAPTER VI.

ELIZABETH CONSENTS TO PROTECT THE BELGIAN INSURGENTS — CONCLUDES A TREATY WITH JAMES OF SCOTLAND—INTRIGUES OF MORGAN AND PAGET—BABINGTON'S PLOT—DETECTION AND EXECUTION OF THE CONSPIRATORS—PROCEEDINGS AGAINST MARY — HER TRIAL AT FOTHERINGAY — JUDGMENT AGAINST HER —PETITION OF PARLIAMENT—INTERCESSION OF THE KINGS OF FRANCE AND SCOTLAND—HER EXECUTION—THE DISSIMULATION OF ELIZABETH —WHO PUNISHES HER COUNSELLORS—AND APPEASES THE FRENCH AND SCOTTISH KINGS.

Origin of the league in France... 396
Treaty between Elizabeth and the Belgian insurgents 397
Treaty with Scotland 399
Quarrel between Elizabeth and Leicester 401
Campaign in the Netherlands ... 403
Parties in favour of Mary Stuart 404
Morgan's intrigues 405
Pooley 407
Gifford ... ... *ib.*
Ballard 411
Babington 413
Counterplot of Walsingham ... 414
Conspiracy 415
Transmission of correspondence 417
Babington's letter to Mary ... 418
Mary's answer 419
Flight of the conspirators ... 421
Apprehension of Ballard ... 422
And of the other conspirators ... 424
Seizure of Mary's papers ... 425
Trial of the conspirators ... 427
And execution 428
Their objects 430
Proceedings against Mary ... 431
Her secretaries examined ... 432
Commission for her trial ... 434
Her judges 435
She objects to their authority ... 435
Consents to plead 436
First charge against her ... 438
Second charge 439
The proofs of the charge ... *ib.*
Her defence 441
Judgment against her 444
Elizabeth's hesitation 445
Her answer to the parliament... 446
Sentence of death announced to Mary 447
Her last requests to Elizabeth... 450
Elizabeth eludes the request of the king of France 452
Refuses that of the king of Scots 454
Signs the warrant 456
But proposes private assassination *ib.*
Dissembles with Davison .. 457
The commissioners at Fotheringay 459

The death warrant read to Mary 459
Mary makes oath of her innocence 460
Her employment during the night 462
She is summoned to the scaffold 463
Her discourse with Melville ... 464
She demands that her servants be admitted 465
Enters the hall ... ... ib.
Is addressed by the dean of Peterborough 467
And beheaded 469
Dissimulation of Elizabeth ... 470
Who punishes Davison the secretary 474
Appeases James... 475
And the king of France .. 477

CHAPTER VII.

MARITIME AND PIRATICAL EXPEDITIONS — HAWKINS — DRAKE — CAVENDISH — DISCONTENT OF THE HOLLANDERS — LOSS OF SLUYS — RETURN OF LEICESTER — HATTON MADE CHANCELLOR — PREPARATIONS OF PHILIP — OF ELIZABETH — THE ARMADA SAILS FROM LISBON — ENTERS THE CHANNEL — IS DISPERSED — AND COMPELLED TO RETURN BY THE NORTH OF SCOTLAND — MAGNANIMITY OF PHILIP — ELIZABETH VISITS THE ARMY AT TILBURY — LEICESTER DIES — HIS CHARACTER.

Commercial enterprise 479
The slave-trade 480
Piratical expedition of Drake ... 481
He sails round the globe ... 482
Is knighted by Elizabeth ... 483
Commands an expedition to the West Indies 484
Voyage of Cavendish ... ... ib.
Desertion from the English army in Holland 485
Discontent of the Belgians ... 486
Drake's expedition to Cadiz ... 488
Loss of Sluys 489
Disputes between Leicester and the Hollanders 490
Hatton is made chancellor ... 492
Philip prepares to invade England 497
His negotiation with the pope ... 498
His army and navy 499
Preparations of Elizabeth ... 500
Her army ... ... ib.
Her navy... 501
Hesitation of the king of Scotland 502
Conduct of the Catholics ... 504
The conferences respecting peace 506
Armada sails from the Tagus ... 508
It enters the Channel 510
Several actions between the fleets ib.
The armada dispersed by fire-ships 512
Suffers considerable loss ... ib.
Returns to Spain by the north of Scotland 513
The queen visits the army at Tilbury 515
The death of Leicester 516
His character 517

CHAPTER VIII.

CONDEMNATION OF THE EARL OF ARUNDEL — SUFFERINGS OF THE CATHOLICS — OF THE PURITANS — FAVOUR OF THE EARL OF ESSEX — UNFORTUNATE EXPEDITION AGAINST SPAIN — PROCEEDINGS IN FRANCE — SUCCESSION OF HENRY IV. — SUCCOURS SENT TO HIM FROM ENGLAND — EXECUTION OF LOPEZ — CAPTURE OF CADIZ — PROJECT IN FAVOUR OF A SPANISH SUCCESSOR — ANOTHER EXPEDITION AGAINST SPAIN — SPANISH FLEET IN THE CHANNEL — PEACE BETWEEN FRANCE AND SPAIN — DISSENSIONS IN THE CABINET — EXECUTION OF SQUIRES — DEATH OF BURGHLEY — CONDUCT OF THE KING OF SCOTLAND.

Public demonstrations of joy ... 520
Trial of the earl of Arundel ... 521
His death 524
Sufferings of the Catholics ... 525
Penalties of recusancy 527
The lot of the poorer recusants 528
Domiciliary searches 529
Proceedings against the Puritans 531

Condemnation of Udal 532
Imprisonment of Cartwright ... *ib.*
Execution of Hacket 533
Proceedings in parliament ... 535
Act against Protestant recusants *ib.*
Execution of Penry 536
Expedients to raise money ... 537
The earl of Essex in favour ... 538
Expedition to Corunna 540
And Lisbon 541
Rivals of Essex 542
Proceedings in France 543
Assassination of Henry III. ... 545
Succession of Henry IV. ... *ib.*
Expeditions to France 548
The king abjures the reformed creed 551
Plots against the queen's life ... 552
Trial and execution of Lopez ... 554
Henry threatens to make peace with Spain 556
The Spaniards take Calais ... 557
Failure of an expedition to the West Indies 559
A new expeditien against Spain 560
Naval victory at Cadiz 561
Surrender of the city 562
Return of the expedition ... 563
Discontent of the queen... ... 564
Defence of Essex 566
His quarrels with the queen ... 567
Projects in favour of a Spanish successor 569
Expedition against Spain ... 572
Dispersed by a storm 573
A Spanish fleet in the Channel... *ib.*
New quarrels between the queen and Essex 574
Henry offers to make peace with Spain 576
It is concluded 578
Dispute in the English cabinet... *ib.*
Essex receives a blow from the queen 579
They are apparently reconciled... *ib.*
Execution of Squires 581
Perplexity of the king of Scotland 583
His plan of conduct 584
His negotiations in Italy and Spain 586
Complaints by Elizabeth ... 588
Valentine Thomas 589

CHAPTER IX.

TRANSACTIONS IN IRELAND — ADMINISTRATION OF PERROT—HIS TRIAL AND DEATH — REBELLION OF TYRONE—HIS VICTORY AT BLACKWATER — ESSEX LORD DEPUTY—HIS DISOBEDIENCE OF THE QUEEN'S ORDERS—CONFERENCE WITH TYRONE — RETURN TO ENGLAND — IMPRISONMENT AND TRIAL IN THE STAR-CHAMBER—HIS ATTEMPT TO RAISE THE CITY — HIS FAILURE, TRIAL, AND CONDEMNATION —HIS DEATH AND CHARACTER — OPPOSITION TO MONOPOLIES—VICTORIES OF MOUNTJOY IN IRELAND — SUBMISSION OF TYRONE — SECRET UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN JAMES OF SCOTLAND AND CECIL—DECLINING HEALTH AND LOW SPIRITS OF THE QUEEN—HER LAST SICKNESS AND DEATH—HER CHARACTER.

Perrot lord deputy 591
Is tried and condemned for high treason... 593
Rebellion of Tyrone 594
Essex lord deputy 595
He offends the queen 596
Alarm of invasion 597
Essex disobeys orders 598
Makes a truce with Tyrone ... *ib.*
Returns to England without leave 599
The queen's displeasure... ... *ib.*
She refuses to be reconciled ... 600
His trial and censure 603
His dangerous projects 605
He solicits the aid of the king of Scots 606
Breaks into rebellion 607
Imprisons the lords sent by the queen 610
Calls on the citizens to arm ... *ib.*
Is compelled to return 611
And made prisoner 612
Execution of Thomas Lee ... *ib.*
Trial of the two earls 613
Defence of Essex 614
Of Southampton... 615
Altercation with Cecil ... ... *ib.*
They are found guilty 617
And condemned... 618
Confession of Essex 619
Elizabeth signs the warrant ... 620
He is executed ... ... *ib.*
His character 621
Southampton is spared 622

Demands of the king of Scots ... 624
Proceedings of Mountjoy ... 626
Complaint of monopolies in parliament 627
The queen yields... 629
Defeat of the Spaniards in Ireland *ib.*
Submission of Tyrone 631
Expedition by sea 632
The queen's infirmities 633
Cecil's counsel to James ... 634
Designs of the exiles 637
Of the Spanish party 638
Of their opponents 639
Controversy respecting the archpriest 640
Proclamation against the missionaries 642
Their protestation of allegiance 643
The queen's melancholy... ... 644
Her last illness 645
Her obstinacy 647
Her alarms ... ... *ib.*
Her death 648
Elizabeth's reputation 649
Her disputes with her ministers 651
Her irresolution ... ... *ib.*
Her economy 653
Her state and deportment ... 654
Her love of popularity 655
Her talents and acquirements ... 656
Her vanity ... ... *ib.*
Her fondness for dress 657
Her irritability 659
Her amours ... ... *ib.*
Her government despotic ... 660
Corruption of courts of justice... 661
Arbitrary proceedings 662
Imprisonment at her pleasure .. 663
Extension of the law of treason... *ib.*
Subsidies and forced loans ... 664

NOTES 667

HISTORY

OF

ENGLAND.

CHAPTER I.

ELIZABETH.

CONTEMPORARY PRINCES.

Emperors.	*Scotland.*	*France.*	*Spain.*
Ferdinand.... 1564	Mary..... 1587	Henry II. ... 1559	Philip II..... 1598
Maximilian... 1576	James VI.	Francis II.... 1560	Philip III.
Rodolph.		Charles IX.. 1574	
		Henry III... 1589	
		Henry IV.	

Popes.

Paul IV., 1559. Pius IV., 1565. Pius V., 1572. Gregory XIII., 1585. Sixtus V., 1590. Urban VII., 1590. Gregory XIV., 1591. Innocent IX., 1591. Clement VIII.

ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH—ABOLITION OF THE CATHOLIC WORSHIP—PEACE WITH FRANCE AND SCOTLAND—WAR OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION—INTRIGUES OF CECIL WITH THE REFORMERS—SIEGE OF LEITH—TREATIES OF PEACE—RETURN OF MARY STUART TO SCOTLAND—SUITORS OF ELIZABETH.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1558. Nov. 17.

WHATEVER opinion men might entertain of the legitimacy of Elizabeth, she ascended the throne without opposition. Mary had expired about noon; and in a short time the Commons received a message to attend at the bar of the house of Lords. On their arrival, the important event was announced by Archbishop Heath, the lord chancellor. God, he said, had taken to his

CHAP. I. A.D. 1558

mercy their late sovereign the lady Mary, and had given them another in the person of her royal sister the lady Elizabeth. Of the right of Elizabeth there could be no doubt. It had been established by the statute of the thirty-fifth Henry VIII.; and nothing remained for the two houses but to discharge their duty, by recognizing the accession of the new sovereign. Her title was immediately proclaimed, first in Westminster Hall, and again at Temple Bar, in presence of the lord mayor, the aldermen, and the companies of the city.[1]

From the palace a deputation of the council repaired to Hatfield, the residence of the new queen. She received them courteously, and to their congratulations replied in a formal and studied discourse. She was struck with amazement when she considered herself and the dignity to which she had been called. Her shoulders were too weak to support the burden; but it was her duty to submit to the will of God, and to seek the aid of wise and faithful advisers. For this purpose she would in a few days appoint a new council. It was her intention to retain several of those who had been inured to business under her father, brother, and sister; and, if the others were not employed, she would have them to believe, that it was not through distrust of their ability or will to serve her, but through a wish to avoid that indecision and delay which so often arise from the jarring opinions of a multitude of advisers.[2]

This answer had been suggested by the man to whom she had already given her confidence, Sir William Cecil, formerly secretary to Edward VI.

[1] Journal of Commons, 53. Camden, i. 2, 5.
[2] Nugæ Antiquæ, i. 66.

Having obtained a pardon, in the last reign, for his share in the treason of Northumberland, he had sought, by feigning an attachment to the Catholic faith, to worm himself into the good graces of Mary. But that queen, though Cardinal Pole professed to be his friend, always doubted his sincerity; her reserve, joined to her increasing infirmities, taught him to divert his devotion from "the setting, to the rising "sun;" and Elizabeth accepted with joy and gratitude the services of so able and experienced a statesman.[1]

Cecil was appointed secretary; and the queen with his aid named the members of her council. Of the advisers of Mary she retained those who were distinguished for their capacity, or formidable by their influence; and to these she added eight others, who had deserved that honour by their former attachment to her in her troubles, or owed it to their connection with the secretary by consanguinity or friendship. It was remarked, that all the old counsellors professed themselves Catholics, all the new, Protestants; that the former comprised several who, in the last reign, had proved most active champions of the ancient faith; the latter, some who had suffered imprisonment or exile for their adherence to the reformed doctrines.[2]

[1] Philopater, 24—26. Dr. Nares, in his "Memoirs of Lord "Burghley," has furnished us with the following proof of Cecil's conformity under Mary, from a certificate in the writing of his steward, and endorsed by himself:—"The Wimbledon Easter-book, "1556." "The names of them that dwelleth in the pariche of "Wimbletown, that was confessed and resaved the sacrament of "the altre. My master Sir Wilyem Cecil, and my Lady Mildreade "his wyfe, &c." Cecil, though a layman, had been made rector of Wimbledon in Edward's reign, and occupied the parsonage-house.

[2] Camden, i. 26, 27. The old councillors were, Archbishop Heath, the marquess of Winchester, the earls of Arundel, Shrewsbury, Derby, and Pembroke, the lords Clinton and Howard of Effing-

CHAP. I. A.D. 1558.

In a body composed of such discordant elements, much harmony could not be expected; but this council was rather for show than real use; there was another and secret cabinet, consisting of Cecil and his particular friends, who possessed the ear of the queen, and controlled through her every department in the state.

One of the first cares of the new government was to notify to the people and to foreign courts the death of Mary, and the succession of the new sovereign; but this was done in language which shadowed forth the coming changes already in contemplation. Though the statute of Henry VIII. by which Elizabeth had been pronounced illegitimate was still in force, she was made in her proclamation to the people to style herself "the only right heyre in bludde,"[1] and in her letters to foreign princes to attribute her succession to her right of inheritance, and the consent of the nation.[2] The instructions sent to the ambassadors varied according to the presumed disposition of the courts at which they resided. The emperor Ferdinand and Philip of Spain were assured of the intention of the queen to maintain and strengthen the existing alliance between the house of Austria and the English crown. To the king of Denmark, the duke of Holstein, and the Lutheran princes of Germany, a confidential

ham, the knights Cheney, Petre, Mason, and Sackville, and the civilian Dr. Boxall; the new, the earl of Bedford, William Parr, who recovered his former title of marquess of Northampton (January 15, 1559), Sir William Cecil, Ambrose Cave, Francis Knollis, Thomas Parry, Edward Rogers, and Nicholas Bacon. Knollis and Rogers had gone into exile in the last reign; Cave had always been a zealous partisan of Elizabeth; Parry, who was distantly related to Cecil, held an office in her household; and Bacon, who had risen to eminence in the profession of the law, had married the sister of Lady Cecil.

[1] Strype's Annals, i. App. No. 1. [2] Camden.

communication was made of her attachment to the reformed faith, and of her wish to cement an union among all its professors.[1] We are even told that Sir Edward Carne, who had been, during four years, the resident ambassador in Rome, was ordered to acquaint the pontiff that she had succeeded to her sister, and had determined to offer no violence to the consciences of her subjects, whatever might be their religious creed. But his ear, so the story runs, had been preoccupied by the diligence of the French ambassador, who suggested that to admit the succession of Elizabeth would be to approve the pretended marriage of her parents, Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn; to annul the decisions of Clement VII. and Paul III.; to prejudge the claim of the true and legitimate heir, Mary queen of Scots; and to offend the king of France, who had determined to support the right of his daughter-in-law with all the power of his realm. When, therefore, Carne performed his commission, Paul replied, that he was unable to comprehend the hereditary right of one who was not born in lawful wedlock; that the queen of Scots claimed the crown as the nearest legitimate descendant of Henry VII.; but that, if Elizabeth were willing to submit the controversy to his arbitration, she should receive from him every indulgence which justice could allow.[2]

The whole of this narrative is undoubtedly a fiction, invented, it is probable, by the enemies of the pontiff, to throw on him the blame of the subsequent rupture between England and Rome. Carne was, indeed, still in that city; but his commission had expired at

[1] Camden, i. 28. Carne died in Rome, January 11, 1561.

[2] Pallavicino, ii. xiv. c. 8. Spondan. ii. 579. Fra-Paolo, Hayward, &c.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1558.

the death of Mary; he could make no official communication without instructions from the new sovereign. According to the ordinary course, he ought to have been revoked, or accredited again to the pontiff. But no more notice was taken of him by the ministers, than they could have done had they been ignorant of his existence. The only information which he obtained of English transactions was derived from the reports of the day. Wearied with the anomalous and painful situation in which he stood, he most earnestly requested to be recalled, and at last succeeded in his request, but not till more than three months after the queen had ascended the throne. It is plain then that Carne made no notification to Paul; and if any one else had been employed for that purpose, some trace of his appointment and his name might be discovered in our national or in foreign documents and historians.[1]

The reader will recollect that, during the reign of her sister, Elizabeth had professed herself a convert to the ancient faith. The Catholics were willing to believe that her conformity arose from conviction; the Protestants, while they lamented her apostasy, persuaded themselves that she feigned sentiments which she did not feel. It is probable that, in her own

[1] In former editions I followed the stream of writers on this subject; the researches of the late Mr. Howard of Corby Castle have convinced me that all are in error. This appears from Carne's letter of December 31 to Cecil (State Paper Office, Bundle No. 4, Rome and Italian states); and an original letter in Cotton MS. Nero, B. vi. p. 9. His letter of recall was dated February 9, and received by him March 10. The same appears also from a Mandamus to Carne from the cardinal secretary of state enclosed in the last letter, stating that hucusque Carne had had no appointment but from Queen Mary. In an extract from a letter of Carne of February 14, 1559, to the queen, he says, that a cardinal had informed him that the pope wished to have some one accredited from her.—Burleigh Papers by Murdin, February 14, 1559.

mind, she was indifferent to either form of worship; but her ministers, whose prospects depended on the change, urged their mistress to put down a religion which proclaimed her a bastard, and to support the reformed doctrines, which alone could give stability to her throne. After some hesitation Elizabeth complied; but the caution of Cecil checked the precipitancy of the zealots, who condemned every delay as an additional offence to God; and a resolution was adopted to suppress all knowledge of the intended measure, till every precaution had been taken to insure its success.[1]

With this view the following plan was submitted to the approbation of the queen: 1. To forbid all manner of sermons, that the preachers might not excite their hearers to resistance; 2. To intimidate the clergy by prosecutions under the statutes of premunire and other penal laws; 3. To debase in the eyes of the people all who had been in authority under the late queen, by rigorous inquiries into their conduct, and by bringing them, whenever it was possible, under the lash of the law; 4. To remove the present magistrates, and to appoint others, "meaner in substance and younger in "years," but better affected to the reformed doctrines; 5. To name a secret committee of divines, who should revise and correct the liturgy published by Edward VI.; and lastly, to communicate the plan to no other persons than Parr, the late marquess of Northampton, the earls of Bedford and Pembroke, and the lord John

[1] Nonnulli ex intimis consiliariis in aures assidue insurrarunt, dum timerent ne animus in dubio facillime impelleretur, actum de ipsa et amicis esse, si pontificiam auctoritatem, &c.—Camden, 30. Regina interea, etsi aperte faveat nostræ causæ, tamen partim a suis, quorum consilio omnia geruntur, partim a legato Philippi Comite Ferio, homine Hispano, ne quid patiatur innovari, mirifice deterretur.—Jewel to P. Martyr, 20 March, 1559. Burnet, iv. 551. October.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1558.

Grey, till the time should arrive when it must be laid before the whole council.[1]

Hitherto Elizabeth, by the ambiguity of her conduct, had contrived to balance the hopes and fears of the two parties. She continued to assist, and occasionally

Dec. 14. to communicate, at mass; she buried her sister with

Dec. 23. all the solemnities of the Catholic ritual; and she ordered a solemn dirge, and a mass of requiem, for the soul of the emperor Charles V. But if these things served to lessen the apprehensions of the Catholics, there was also much to flatter the expectations of the gospellers. The prisoners for religion were discharged on their own recognizances to appear whenever they should be called; the reformed divines returned from exile, and appeared openly at court; and Oglethorpe,

Dec. 25. bishop of Carlisle, preparing to say mass in the royal chapel on Christmas day, received an order not to elevate the host in the royal presence. He replied that his life was the queen's, but that his conscience was his own; on which Elizabeth, rising immediately after the gospel, retired with her attendants.[2]

By degrees the secret was suffered to transpire. The bishops saw with surprise that White, of Winchester, had been imprisoned for his sermon at the funeral of Queen Mary,[3] and that Bonner, of London, was called upon to account for the different fines which had been levied in his courts during the last reign. Archbishop Heath either received a hint, or deemed it prudent, to resign the seals, which, with the

[1] See a paper published by Burnet, ii. 327; and more accurately by Strype, Annals, i. Rec. 4.

[2] Camden, 32, 33. Allen, Answer to English Justice, 51. Loseley MSS. 184. It was at the offertory, not at the elevation, that she withdrew.—Memorias, 13.

[3] This sermon may be seen in Strype's Memorials, iii. Rec. 278—288.

title of lord keeper, were transferred to Sir Nicholas Bacon. But that which cleared away every doubt was a proclamation, forbidding the clergy to preach, and ordering the established worship to be observed "until consultation might be had in parliament by the "queen and the three estates."[1] Alarmed by this clause, the bishops assembled in London, and consulted whether they could in conscience officiate at the coronation of a princess who, it was probable, would object to some part of the service as ungodly and superstitious, and who, if she did not refuse to take, certainly meant to violate, that part of the oath which bound the sovereign to maintain the liberties of the established church. The question was put, and was unanimously resolved in the negative.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1558. Dec. 22. Dec. 27.

This unexpected determination of the prelates created considerable embarrassment. Much importance was still attached to the rite of coronation. It was thought necessary that the ceremony should be performed before the queen met her parliament; and it was feared that the people would not consider it valid unless it were performed by a prelate of the establishment. Many expedients were devised to remove or surmount the difficulty; and at last the bishop of Carlisle separated himself from his colleagues. But, if he was prevailed upon to crown the queen, she on her part was compelled to take the accustomed oath, to receive the sacrament under one kind, and to conform to all the rites of the Catholic pontifical. No expense was spared by the court or by the citizens; but the absence of the prelates threw an unusual

1559. Jan. 2. Jan. 15.

[1] Wilk. Con. iv. 180. It allowed no other alteration in the service than the recital in English of the Lord's prayer, the creed, the litany, the commandments, and the epistle and gospel of the day.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

gloom over the ceremony. Their example was imitated by the Conde de Feria, the Spanish ambassador, who was invited, but under the pretence of sickness declined to attend.[1]

Cecil had now completed every arrangement preparatory to the meeting of parliament. Five new peers, of Protestant principles, had been added to the upper house:[2] in the lower, a majority had been secured by the expedient of sending to the sheriffs a list of court candidates, out of whom the members were to be chosen;[3] and the committee of reformed divines, who had secretly assembled in the house of Sir Thomas Smith, had moulded the Book of Common Prayer into a less objectionable form. On the twenty-fifth of January the queen assisted in state at a solemn high mass, which was followed by a sermon from Dr. Cox, a reformed preacher. The lord keeper then opened the parliament in her presence. He first drew a melancholy picture of the state of the realm under Queen Mary, and next exhibited the cheering prospect of the blessings which awaited it under the new sovereign. She had called the two houses together, that they might consult respecting an uniform order of religion; might remove abuses and enormities, and might provide for the safety of the state against its foreign and domestic enemies. They

Jan. 25.

[1] Camden, 33. Gonzalez, 264. Yet the coronation oath proved no bar to the alienation of the bishops' lands, or the change of religion by act of parliament, in the course of the year.

[2] They were, William Parr, restored to his title of marquess of Northampton; Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford; Thomas, second son of the late duke of Norfolk, Viscount Howard of Bindon; Sir Oliver St. John, Lord Bletso; and Sir Henry Carey, son of Mary Boleyn, Lord Hunsdon.

[3] Strype, i. 32. The court named five candidates for the shires, three for the boroughs.—Clarendon Papers, 92.

were not, however, to suppose that their concurrence was necessary for these purposes—the queen could have effected them, if she had so pleased, of her own authority,—but "she rather sought contentation "by assent, and surety by advice, and was willing to "require of her loving subjects nothing which they "were not contented freely and frankly to offer."[1] CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

Before the Commons proceeded to any business of importance, they voted "an humble but earnest ad- Feb. 4. "dress to the queen, that she would vouchsafe to "accept some match capable of supplying heirs to her "majesty's royal virtues and dominions." It was presented by the speaker, attended by thirty members. There was, perhaps, no subject on which Elizabeth could less brook the officious interference of others; but on this occasion policy taught her to bridle her Feb. 10. resentment; and she replied, that, though during the last reign she had many powerful inducements to marry, she had, nevertheless, preferred and still continued to prefer, a single life. What might hereafter happen, she could not foresee; if she took a husband, her object would be the welfare of her people; if she did not, God would provide a successor. For herself, she should be content to have it inscribed on her tomb, that she had reigned and died a maiden queen. But whatever she thought of the matter, she was pleased with the manner of their address; because it did not, as it ought not, presume to point out either the person or the place. It was not for them "to "draw her love to their liking, or to frame her will "by their fantasy. Theirs it was to beg, not to pre- "scribe; to obey, not to bind." She would therefore take their coming in good part, and dismiss them with

[1] D'Ewes, 11.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

her thanks, not for their petition, but for their intention.[1]

The reader is aware, that both Mary and Elizabeth, though they had been pronounced illegitimate by act of parliament, were afterwards called to the throne by the statute of the thirty-fifth of Henry VIII. Mary, on her accession, had been careful to wipe away the stain of illegitimacy, by procuring in her first parliament a confirmation of her mother's marriage, and a repeal of all statutes or judgments by which it had been impeached. Was Elizabeth to imitate her sister? Her advisers preferred to leave both the act which declared the marriage of Henry with Anne Boleyn void from the beginning, and that which convicted the latter of incest, adultery, and treason, uncontradicted on the statute book, and had recourse to an act of recognition, which, with happy ambiguity of language, blended together her presumed right from her royal descent with that which she derived from the statute; two things inconsistent with each other, because the enactment by statute was founded on the supposition of illegitimacy. It declared that she was and ought to be rightful and lawful queen, rightly, lineally, and lawfully descended and come of the blood royal, to whom, and the heirs of her body lawfully to be begotten, the royal estate, place, crown, and dignity, with all its titles and appurtenances, belonged, as rightfully as they ever did to her father, brother, and sister, since the act of succession passed in the thirty-fifth of Henry VIII.; and then enacted that this recognition, in union with the limitation in that statute, should be the law of the realm for ever, and that every judgment or act derogatory from either,

[1] D'Ewes, 46; and Journals of Commons, 54.

should be void and of no effect, and might be cancelled at the queen's pleasure.[1] In addition, an act was passed, which, without reversing the attainder of Anne Boleyn, restored Elizabeth in blood, and rendered her inheritable to her mother, and to all her ancestors on the part of her said mother.[2]

But the subject which principally occupied the attention of parliament was the alteration of religion. With this view, the statutes passed in the late reign for the support of the ancient faith were repealed, and the acts of Henry VIII. in derogation of the papal authority, and of Edward VI. in favour of the reformed service, were in a great measure revived. It was enacted that the Book of Common Prayer, with certain additions and emendations, should alone be used by the ministers in all churches, under the penalties of forfeiture, deprivation, and death; that the spiritual authority of every foreign prelate within the realm should be utterly abolished; that the jurisdiction necessary for the correction of errors, heresies, schisms, and abuses, should be annexed to the crown, with the power of delegating such jurisdiction to any person or persons whatsoever, at the pleasure of

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 358. It may have been the object of this clause to establish more firmly the title of Elizabeth; indirectly, however, it affected, in the eyes of the public, the right of the young queen of Scots, the next heir. For the limitation in the statute gave the succession, after Elizabeth, to those individuals to whom Henry should assign it by his last will; and the instrument, purporting to be that will, had overlooked the Scottish line to substitute in its place the numerous descendants of Henry's younger sister, the French queen. This was the first of those unfriendly offices which the unfortunate Mary Stuart received from her English cousin. The French court appears to have felt and resented it as an affront. No remonstrance was, indeed, made; but within a month the king dauphin had quartered in his coat the arms of England with those of Scotland, in right of his wife.—Forbes, State Papers, i. 131.

[2] Stat. of Realm, iv. 397.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. the sovereign;[1] that the penalty of asserting the papal authority should ascend, on the repetition of the offence, from the forfeiture of real and personal property to perpetual imprisonment, and from perpetual imprisonment to death, as it was inflicted in cases of high treason; and that all clergymen taking orders, or in possession of livings, all magistrates and inferior officers having fees or wages from the crown, all laymen suing out the livery of their lands, or about to do homage to the queen, should, under pain of deprivation and incapacity, take an oath declaring her to be supreme governor in all ecclesiastical and spiritual things or causes as well as temporal, and renouncing all foreign ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction or authority whatsoever within the realm.[2]

On the part of the clergy, these bills experienced a Feb. 28. most vigorous but fruitless opposition. The convocation presented to the house of Lords a declaration of its belief in the real presence, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, and the supremacy of the pope; with a protestation, that to decide on doctrine, sacraments, and discipline, belonged not to any lay assembly, but to the lawful pastors of the church.[3] Both March 10. universities subscribed the confession of the convo-

[1] It was, however, provided that these delegates should not have the power to adjudge any matter to be heresy which had not been so adjudged by some general council, or the express words of Scripture, or should afterwards be adjudged to be so by the high court of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation.—Stat. 1 Eliz. c. 1.

[2] See note (A). Many other bills for a further reformation were introduced and abandoned; particularly the queen would not agree to the revival of the act of Edward VI. legalizing the marriages of the clergy. They should be content, she said, if she connived at them; for she would never sanction them. "This," exclaims Sands, in a letter to Parker, "is nothing else than to bastard our "children."—Burnet, ii. Rec. 332.

[3] Wilk. Con. iv. 179.

cation; and the bishops unanimously seized every opportunity to speak and to vote against the measure.[1] To dissolve or neutralize this opposition, an ingenious expedient was devised. Five bishops and three doctors on the one side, and eight reformed divines on the other, received the royal command to dispute in public on certain controverted points. Bacon, the lord keeper, was commissioned to act as moderator; and the debates of the two houses were suspended, that the members might have leisure to attend to the controversy. It had been ordered that on each day the Catholics should begin, and the reformers should answer; but on the second morning the prelates objected to an arrangement which gave so palpable an advantage to their adversaries; and, when Bacon refused to listen to their remonstrances, declared that the conference was at an end. The council immediately committed the bishops of Winchester and Lincoln to the Tower, and bound the other six disputants in their own recognizances to make their appearance daily, till judgment should be pronounced.[2] It was pretended that they had deserved this severity by their disobedience; but the real object was, by the imprisonment of the two prelates, and the fear of the punishment which threatened the others, to

April 3.

April 4.

[1] The speeches of the archbishop of York, of the bishop of Chester, and of Feckenham, abbot of Westminster, may be seen in Strype, i. Rec. 7, et seq. In this opposition they were encouraged by the Spanish ambassador, at whose disposal Philip had placed the sum of 60,000 crowns, to be "economically" employed in support of the Catholic cause.—Gonzalez, 267.

[2] They attended daily, from the 5th of April till after the dissolution of the parliament, and on the 10th of May were fined, the bishop of Lichfield in 500 marks, of Carlisle 250 pounds, of Chester 200 marks, Dr. Cole 500 marks, Dr. Harpsfield 40 pounds, and Dr. Chedsey 40 marks.—Strype, i. 87, Rec. 41. Foxe, iii. 822. Burnet, ii. 390, Rec. 333.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

silence the opposition in the house of Lords. The bill in favour of the new Book of Common Prayer was now read a last time, and was carried by a majority of three. Nine spiritual and nine temporal peers voted against it.[1]

After these enactments, it devolved on the queen to provide a new hierarchy for the new church. She first sent for the bishops then in London, and required them to conform; but they pleaded the prohibition of conscience, and were dismissed with expressions of

July. scorn and resentment. The next step was to tender to them the oath of supremacy; on their refusal they were deprived of their bishoprics, and committed to custody. The same fate awaited their colleagues in

September the country; and, before winter, all Queen Mary's

October. prelates were weeded out of the church, with the

November. exception of Kitchin, who submitted to take the oath, and, in consequence, was suffered to retain the see of Landaff.[2] To supply their places a selection had been made out of the exiles who hastened back from Geneva, Basle, and Frankfort, and out of the clergymen in England, who during the last reign had distinguished themselves by their attachment to the reformed worship. At their head Elizabeth resolved to place, as metropolitan, both through respect to the memory of her mother, and in reward of his own merit, Dr. Matthew Parker, formerly chaplain to Anne Boleyn,

[1] It is extraordinary that, in the journals of the Lords, no trace remains of the proceedings during the week in which this bill was read three times and passed, that is, from April 22 to May 1. Yet it appears, from the references in D'Ewes (p. 28), that the proceedings were regularly entered. Two bishops were prevented from voting by their detention in the Tower, and Feckenham was also absent. The non-contents were, the marquess of Winchester, the earl of Shrewsbury, the viscount Montague, the lords Morley, Stafford, Dudley, Wharton, Rich, and North.—D'Ewes, ibid.

[2] See note (B).

and, under Edward, dean of the church of Lincoln. In obedience to a congé d'élire, he was chosen by a portion of the chapter—the major part refusing to attend; but four months were suffered to elapse between his election and his entrance on the archiepiscopal office. This was on account of two very extraordinary impediments.[1] By the revival of the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII., it was made necessary that the election of the archbishop should be confirmed, and his consecration be performed by four bishops. But how were four bishops to be found, when, by the deprivation of the Catholic prelates there remained in the kingdom but one lawful bishop,—he of Landaff? Again, the use of the ordinal of Edward VI. had been abolished by parliament in the last reign, that of the Catholic ordinal by parliament in the present; in what manner then was Parker to be consecrated, when there existed no form of consecration recognized by law? Six theologians and canonists were consulted, who returned an opinion, that, in a case of such urgent necessity, the queen possessed the power of supplying every defect through the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority, as head of the church. In conformity with this answer, a commission with a sanatory clause was issued,[2] and four of the commissioners, Barlowe, the deprived bishop of Bath, and Hodgkins, once suffragan of Bedford, who had both been consecrated according to the Catholic pontifical, and Scorey, the deprived bishop of Chichester, and Coverdale, the deprived bishop of Exeter, who had both been consecrated according to the reformed ordi-

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. Aug. 1.

Dec. 6.

Dec. 9.

[1] See Parker's letter in Strype's Parker, with the notes upon it written by Cecil, p. 40.

[2] Rym. xv. 549.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. nal, proceeded to confirm the election of Parker, and then to consecrate him after the form adopted towards the close of the reign of Edward VI. A few days later, Parker, as archbishop, confirmed the election of two of those by whom his own election had been confirmed,—of Barlowe to the see of Chichester, and of Scorey to that of Hereford; and then, assuming them for his assistants—for three bishops were requisite by law—confirmed and consecrated all the other prelates elect.[1]

Dec. 17.
Dec. 20.

The new bishops, however, were doomed to meet with a severe disappointment on their very entry into office. It had been the uniform practice, wherever the Reformation penetrated, to reward the services of its lay abettors out of the possessions of the church; but in England it was conceived that few gleanings of this description could now remain after the spoliations of the late reigns. Still the ingenuity of Elizabeth's advisers discovered a resource hitherto unobserved, and had procured two acts to be passed in the late parliament, by the first of which all the ecclesiastical property restored by Queen Mary to the church was re-annexed to the crown; and by the other the queen was empowered, on the vacancy of any bishopric, to take possession of the lands belonging to such bishopric, with the exception of the chief mansion-house and its domain, on condition that she gave in return an equivalent in tithes and parsonages appropriate. Now, by the deprivation of the Catholic prelates every bishopric but one had become vacant, and commissioners had already been appointed to carry into effect the exchange contemplated by the act. The new

[1] See note (C).

prelates saw with dismay this attempt to tear from their respective sees the most valuable of their possessions. They ventured to expostulate with their royal patroness; they appealed to her charity and piety; they offered her a yearly present of one thousand pounds. But their efforts were fruitless; she refused to accept their homage, or to restore their temporalities, till the work of spoliation was completed. Then they accepted their bishoprics in the state to which they had been reduced; and the lands taken from them were distributed by the queen among the more needy or the more rapacious of her favourites.[1]

1560. March 21.

After the consecration of the new bishops, there was little to impede the progress of the reformed worship. The oath of supremacy was tendered by them to the clergy of their respective dioceses. In general it was refused by the deans, prebendaries, archdeacons, and the leading members of the universities, who sacrificed their offices and emoluments, and in some cases their personal liberty, to the dictates of their consciences; but among the lower orders of the clergy, many thought proper to conform, some through partiality for the new doctrines, some through the dread of poverty, and some under the persuasion that the present would soon be followed by another religious revolution. With the aid of commissions, injunctions, and visitations, the church was gradually purged of the non-juring clergy; but their absence left a considerable vacancy, which was but inadequately supplied by the reformed ministers; and it became necessary to establish for the moment a class of lay instructors, consisting of mechanics,

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 381. Strype, i. 97.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

licensed to read the service to the people in the church, but forbidden to administer the sacrament.[1]

While the ministry were thus employed in the alteration of religion at home, their attention was also claimed by an important negotiation abroad. During the last summer, the three belligerent powers, England, France, and Spain, alike exhausted by the war, had sent their respective commissioners to the abbey of Cercamp; but the conferences were interrupted by the obstinacy of Philip, who refused to accede to any terms which did not secure to the queen of England the restoration of Calais, and to Philibert of Savoy that of his hereditary dominions. On the death of Mary, the earl of Arundel, leaving his colleagues, the bishop of Ely and Dr. Wotton, at the court of Brussels, returned to England; and the French king seized the opportunity to open a clandestine correspondence with Elizabeth, through the agency of the lord Grey, a prisoner of war, and of Guido Cavalcanti, a gentleman of Florence. His object was to detach the queen from her confederacy with Philip; but the English ministers, aware that to separate from Spain would be to throw their mistress on the mercy of France, ordered the lord Howard of Effingham to join the resident ambassadors, and to attend, in conjunction with the Spanish envoys, the new conferences at Cateau Cambresis. The disputes between Spain and France were speedily arranged; and to cement the friendship between the two crowns, it was proposed that Philip should marry the daughter, Philibert the sister of Henry; a proposal to which the Spanish king, after the fruitless offer of his hand to Elizabeth,

1559. Feb. 7.

[1] Strype, i. 139, 178, 240.

gave his assent. Faithful, however, to his engagements, the Spanish monarch refused to sign the treaty till the English cabinet should be satisfied; and he even offered to continue the war for six years, provided Elizabeth would bind herself not to conclude a separate peace during that period. Cecil and his colleagues found themselves in a most perplexing dilemma. On the one hand, to surrender the claim to Calais would expose them to the hatred of the nation; on the other, the poverty of the exchequer, the want of disciplined troops, and, above all, the unsettled state of religion, forbade them to protract the war. The ambassadors were finally instructed to obtain the best terms in their power, but to conclude a peace, whatever sacrifices it might cost. With the aid of the Spanish negotiators, they debated every point, gradually receded from one demand to another, and ultimately subscribed to the conditions dictated by their adversaries.[1] The restoration of Calais formed the prominent article in the treaty. It was agreed that the most Christian king should retain possession during the next eight years; that at the expiration of the term he should restore the town with its dependencies to Elizabeth, under the penalty of five hundred thousand crowns; and that he should deliver, as security for that sum, the persons of four French noblemen, and the bonds of eight foreign merchants. This article was meant to cover the honour

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. April 2.

[1] With respect to Calais, the duke of Alva, the chief of the Spanish commissioners, clandestinely favoured the pretensions of the French. He was accused of having been bought by France; but vindicated himself to the satisfaction of Philip, by showing that it was contrary to the joint interest of Spain and Flanders that England should possess complete command of the strait, which she must do, if she possessed Calais as well as Dover.—Rustant. Hist. del Duque de Alva, i. 85.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

of the queen, and to silence the clamour of the people; whatever expectation it might excite, was extinguished by the following provision, that if Henry or the king and queen of Scotland, should make any attempt by arms, directly or indirectly, against the territories or subjects of Elizabeth; or Elizabeth against the territories or subjects of the other contracting parties, the former should from that moment forfeit all right to the retention, the latter her claim to the restoration of the town.[1] It was evident that at the expiration of eight years, French ingenuity would easily discover some real or pretended infraction of the treaty, on which the king might ground his refusal to restore the place. This consequence was foreseen by the public; the terms were condemned as prejudicial and disgraceful; and the ministers, to divert the indignation of the people, ordered the lord Wentworth, the governor of Calais, and Chamberlayne and Hurlestone, captains of the castle and the Risbank, to be brought to trial on charges of cowardice and treason. The former was acquitted by his peers; the latter were found guilty and condemned. But the trials had served the purpose of the court, and the sentence was never carried into execution.[2]

April 22.

Dec. 20.

[1] See the whole of the proceedings in Forbes, State Papers, i. 1—81.

[2] On the conclusion of peace, Feria returned to Spain. When he took leave of the queen, she spoke her mind to him freely, but in private, respecting religion: that she wished to establish in the realm something like the Confession of Augsburg, that she did not differ much in opinion from the Catholics, that she believed the real presence in the sacrament, did not find fault with more than three or four things in the mass, and expected to be saved as well as the bishop of Rome. "Que in muy poco deferia ella de nos otros: "porque creia que Dios estaba en el sacramento de la eucaristia, et "que de la missa le discontaban solo tres o cuatro cosas: que ella "pensaba salvarse tan bien como el obispo de Roma."—Feria to Philip, apud Gonzalez, 22.

During the negotiation no mention was made of one cause of offence, which had sunk deeply into the breast of Elizabeth. Ever since her accession she had, as heiress to the rights of her predecessor, styled herself queen of France. The title was ridiculous, inasmuch as by the fundamental laws of that kingdom no female could inherit the crown; but it had previously been adopted by Mary, and was considered the best expedient by which the queen could transmit this ancient but useless bauble to her successors. Henry of France did not complain; but to retaliate, as he pretended, though there can be no doubt that he acted seriously,[1] he subsequently caused his daughter-in-law to adopt occasionally the style of queen of England and Ireland. This assumption not only wounded the pride, it alarmed the jealousy of Elizabeth; it proved to her that, in the estimation of Henry, she was a bastard; and it taught her to apprehend that, on some future occasion, Mary Stuart might dispute with her the right to the English crown. She had, however, the prudence to suppress her feelings. She concluded treaties of peace with Mary and her consort, both at Cateau Cambresis, and at Upsetlington, in Scotland; engaged to afford no aid nor asylum to the Scottish rebels, and swore on the gospels faithfully to observe these conditions.[2] But Cecil had at the same time a very different object in contemplation. He knew that the Scottish reformers had taken up arms in oppo-

April 2.

May 21.

[1] See Noailles, ii. 250. "You knowe," said the cardinal of Lorrain, "at that time we were at warre with youe; by meanes where-"of we spared not to do anything that might toche you in honour "or otherwise."—Forbes, i. 340. In the peace which took place was an articie saving to all parties their former pretensions; whence it was inferred that Mary was justified in using the same style afterwards.—Ibid. 339.

[2] Rym. xv. 517, 521.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

sition to the queen regent, and he resolved to foment their discontent and to support their rebellion. By enabling them to triumph over the authority of their sovereign, Elizabeth might wrest from the Scottish queen a renunciation of her claim; the French influence in Scotland would be annihilated; the new worship would be established; and the Scottish crown might probably be transferred from the head of Mary to that of a Protestant branch of the house of Stuart. In private he carried his views even farther, and revealed to his confidential friends his hope that, by the marriage of such new sovereign with the English queen, the two realms might be incorporated into one powerful and Protestant kingdom.[1] In the pursuit of such magnificent objects, it would indeed be necessary to violate the peace which had been so lately ratified, and to aid rebellious subjects against the legitimate authority of their sovereign; but in the political creed of the secretary, the end was held to sanctify the means; and his conduct during the war of the Reformation in Scotland will develop those maxims of state which, during the greater part of Elizabeth's reign, prevailed in the English council. Previously, however, it will be necessary to lay before the reader the origin of the contest between the Scottish lords and their sovereign.

Of all the European churches there was perhaps not

[1] That Cecil actually contemplated such events as the result of his policy, and that the Scottish reformers had the same objects in view, is evident from numerous passages in their private correspondence, some of which will be found in the following pages.—See Sadler's State Papers, i. 377, 573, 681; Forbes, 147, 435, 436. Elizabeth asserts, in her instructions to Lord Shrewsbury, that there had been an intent to deprive Mary of her crown, but that she prevented it.—Cotton MSS. Cal. c. ix. 50.

one better prepared to receive the seed of the new gospel than that of Scotland. During a long course of years the highest dignities had, with few exceptions, been possessed by the illegitimate[1] or younger sons of the most powerful families, men who, without learning or morality themselves, paid little attention to the learning or morality of their inferiors. The pride of the clergy, their negligence in the discharge of their functions, and the rigour with which they exacted their dues, had become favourite subjects of popular censure; and when the new preachers appeared, they dexterously availed themselves of the humour of the time, and seasoned their discourses against the doctrines, with invectives against the vices, of the churchmen. Both the prelates, and the earl of Arran, the governor of the kingdom, were alarmed. The former assembled in convocation, and enacted several canons, which had for their object to regulate the morals of the clergy, to enforce the duty of public instruction, and to repress abuses in the collection of the clerical dues.[2] Arran, in two successive parliaments, revived the old statutes against the teachers of heretical doctrines, and strengthened them with the addition of new penalties.[3] But the transfer of the regency from Arran to the queen-mother allowed the reformers 1554. April 12

[1] James V. had provided for his illegitimate children by making them abbots and priors of Holyrood House, Kelso, Melrose, Coldingham, and St. Andrew's. It may be proper to observe, that these commendatory abbots and priors received the income, but interfered not with the domestic economy of the monastery. Though they seldom took orders, they ranked as clergymen, and by their vices continued to throw an odium on the profession. They became, however, converts to the new doctrines; and thus contrived to secure the lands of their benefices, or an equivalent, to themselves and their posterity.

[2] Wilkins, Con. iv. 46, 47, 69, 72, 78.

[3] Black Acts, 147, 151, 152, 154.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1554. time to breathe. During the struggle the lords, by whom they were favoured, had attached themselves to her interests; and they now expected forbearance, if not protection, from her gratitude. The number of the missionaries was increased by the arrival of several preachers, who fled from the persecution in England; and the return of John Knox from Geneva gave a new impulse to their zeal. The enthusiasm of this apostle, the severity of his manner, his rude but commanding eloquence, soon raised him to a high pre-eminence above his fellows. At his suggestion, the chief of the converts assembled in Mearns, and subscribed a covenant, by which they bound themselves to renounce for ever the communion of the established church, and to maintain what they held to be the true doctrine of the gospel. But his boldness was met with threats of vengeance; and preferring the duty of watching over the infant church to the glory of martyrdom, he hastened back to Geneva, whence by letters he supplied the neophytes with ghostly counsel, resolving their doubts, chastising their timidity, and inflaming their zeal. One thing he most earnestly inculcated, the distinction between civil and religious obedience. The former was due to the civil magistrate, the latter to God alone; whence he drew this important inference, that in defiance of the legislature and the sovereign, it was their duty to extirpate idolatry wherever they found it, to establish the gospel, and in defence of their proceedings to oppose force to force.[1] This doctrine, the parent of sedition

1555.

1556. July.

[1] Strype, 119. "Whilk thing, efter all humill requist, yf ye can "not atteane, then with oppin and solemp protestation of your "obedience to be given to the authority in all thingis not planelie "repugnying to God, ye lawfullie may attemp the extreamitie, "whilk is to provyd (whidder the autoritie will consent or no), that

and civil war, was gratefully received, and practically adopted. The proselytes, inflamed by the lessons of their teacher, and the scriptural denunciations against idolatry, abolished, wherever they had power, the worship established by law, expelled the clergy, dissolved the monasteries, and gave the ornaments of the churches, often the churches themselves, to the flames.[1]

It was with pain that the queen regent viewed these illegal proceedings. But she dared not oppose or punish at a time when the approaching marriage of her daughter to the dauphin of France admonished her to win by condescension, rather than alienate by severity. Her efforts were successful; both parties joined in gratifying her wishes; and the estates not only consented to the marriage, but named a deputation to assist at the ceremony.[2] Mary Stuart had just completed her fifteenth year. She was married to Francis, a prince of nearly the same age, in the cathedral of Paris; he was immediately saluted by his consort with the title of king-dauphin; and to

1557. Dec. 8.

1558. April 24.

" Chrystis evangell may be trewlie preachit, and his holie sacra-
" mentis rychtlie ministerit unto you, and to your brethren the sub-
" jectis of that realme. And farder ye lawfullie may, ye, and thairto
" is bound, to defend your brethren from persecutioun and tiranny,
" be it agains princes or emprioris, to the uttermost of your power."
—Letter of Knox apud M'Crie, notes, p. 461.

[1] It is not true, that the burning of churches, &c., was begun by Knox at Perth. These excesses are mentioned thrice in the proceedings of the council held in Edinburgh, which was dissolved before the arrival of Knox in Scotland.—Wilk. Con. iv. 208, 209, 211.

[2] Of the eight deputies, four died before their return. The fact was, that numbers in England, France, and Scotland were carried off this year by a pestilential fever. By the discontented in Scotland, however, the death of the deputies was attributed to poison. One of them, the prior of St. Andrew's, afterwards earl of Murray, had the good fortune to escape through the ingenuity of his physicians, who, if we may believe Pitscottie, hung him up by the heels to let the poison drop out of his mouth!—See Goodall, 154.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1558.

cement the union of the two nations, the natives of each were by legislative acts naturalized in the other.[1]

It was plain (nor had it escaped the notice and censure of Knox), that the reformers, by consenting to the union of their youthful sovereign with the heir apparent of the French monarchy, would yield a considerable advantage to the Catholics; and therefore to compound the matter with their consciences, they had, previously to the opening of the parliament, entered into a new religious covenant. The subscribers, with the earls of Argyle, Morton, and Glencairn at their head, assuming the title of "the Con- "gregation of the Lord," bound themselves to strive to the death in the cause of their Master, to procure and maintain faithful ministers of the gospel, to defend them, the whole congregation, and every member thereof, to the whole of their power, and at the hazard of their lives; to forsake the congregation of Satan (the established church), and to declare them-

1557. Dec. 3.

[1] Keith, 74, 75. Leslie, 492. Spottis. 95. A few days before the marriage, the chancellor of France laid before Mary three deeds for execution. By the first she was made to bequeath, in failure of heirs of her body, her right to the crown of Scotland, and all other her contingent rights, even that to the crown of England, to the king of France and his successors. This was called donatio causâ mortis. By the second she bequeathed the succession to the Scottish crown to the king of France, until he should have indemnified himself for the charges incurred by France in protecting Scotland from its ancient enemies, the English. The third was a formal protest against any consent, which circumstances might compel her to give to a late act of the Scottish parliament, regulating the succession to the Scottish crown. On April 4, Mary formally executed these deeds, and the first two were accepted by the chancellor in the name of the French king. The dauphin added his signature to the last. By Goodall (p. 159), these instruments are pronounced forgeries, but they exist in the Trésor des Chartes, and have been published by Prince Labanoff in his Lettres de Marie Stuart, i. 50—56.

selves manifest enemies to it, its abominations, and its idolatry.[1] CHAP. I. A.D. 1557.

When the purport of this covenant became known, it was considered by the opposite party as a declaration of war. The archbishop of St. Andrew's, as if he sought to probe the sincerity of the subscribers, urged the execution of the laws made or revived under the administration of his brother, the late governor; and Walter Milne, originally a friar, but for many years a preacher of the new doctrines, suffered at the stake. His fate, instead of intimidating, aroused the zeal of the reformers. They rose in their demands; their opponents were equally importunate; and all the efforts of the regent to pacify and conciliate the two parties proved ineffectual. At her request the archbishop had convened a national council, by which the canons lately made were confirmed, and an abstract of doctrine was published in explanation of the tenets misrepresented by the missionaries.[2] But the lords of the congregation did not wait for the result of the council. They established the new service in Perth;[3]

1558. April.

1559. April 6.

[1] Keith, 66. Knox, 98—100.

[2] It teaches that it is lawful to beg of the saints their prayers in favour of sinners, and to keep the images of Christ and his saints, as representations of them, and inducements to the imitation of their virtues; that there is a purgatory after the present life, in which is suffered the punishment yet due to sin; that in the eucharist is the true body and blood of Christ; that communion under both kinds is unnecessary; and that the sacrifice of the mass, established in remembrance of the sufferings of Christ, availeth through the merit of those sufferings, both the living and the dead. —Wilk. Con. iv. 213.

[3] That the Scottish reformers used a written form of worship at first, is certain.—Knox, Hist. 101. The only dispute is, whether it were the form used by the exiles at Geneva, or the liturgy of Edward VI. If the former, as is often maintained, they must have occasionally exchanged it for the latter, perhaps to please Elizabeth; for Cecil writes, July 9, 1559, "they have received the service of "the church of England, according to King Edward's booke."—Forbes, i. 155.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

and the queen immediately summoned three of the preachers to answer before her and the council at Stirling for this violation of the law. The reformers hastened to the support of their teachers; Erskine, of Dun, negotiated a second time between the opposite parties; and the regent, if we may believe some, promised, according to others, refused, to stay all legal proceedings. The appointed day came: the persons summoned did not appear; and according to the forms of the Scottish judicature they were pronounced rebels, with the usual denunciation of punishment against all their aiders and abettors.[1]

May 10.

April 22.

Knox had long ago left Geneva, but had been detained six weeks at Dieppe, by a fruitless attempt to procure from Elizabeth a license to travel through her dominions. He, however, reached Perth a few days before judgment was pronounced against the preachers.

May 11.

When the intelligence arrived, he hastened to the pulpit; the indignation which glowed in his breast was soon communicated to his hearers; and the crowd, maddened by his invectives, defaced the ornaments of the church, demolished the magnificent fabric of the Charter House, with several other convents, and threw into the flames whatever had been contaminated in their eyes by its use in the established worship.[2] In the language of the saints, Perth was said to be "reformed."

[1] Knox, 127. Leslie, 505. Spottis. 121. Balfour, i. 314. According to most of the reformed writers, the queen regent in all these proceedings is charged with dissimulation and falsehood; but it should be remembered that the charge proceeds from those who found it necessary to justify their own violence and rebellion.

[2] This was not the first tumult excited by Knox. Cecil says that "the first begynning of the innovation was at Donfrese, where "Knoxe and others began to preche, and the relligiose persons left "there habites, both there and at Johnstowne" (Perth).—Forbes, 131. June 13.

CHAP. I.

The regent, accompanied by the earl of Arran, who had assumed the French title of duke of Chastelherault, and the earl of Huntley, advanced towards Perth; and the Congregationists assembled in force to oppose her progress. No blood was shed. As often as the armies met in the field, they were separated by a temporary suspension of hostilities. Projects of pacification were repeatedly proposed, adopted, broken, and renewed. But on every occasion the advantage was on the part of the Congregationists. Their zeal refused to be bound by any compact which might interfere with their consciences; wherever they came, they resumed their missionary labours, with the gospel in one hand, and the firebrand in the other;[1] the venerable cathedral of St. Andrew's was demolished; and Crail, Anstruther, Scone, Stirling, Cambuskenneth, and Linlithgow were purged from the pollutions of popery. As they advanced, the capital opened its gates; the regent sought an asylum in the castle of Dunbar; and the cause of the royalists appeared desperate. But Scottish warfare was always marked with sudden alternations of misfortune and success. The adherents of the opposite parties generally acted independently of their chiefs; they joined or abandoned the army at their pleasure; and it often happened that those who to-day could boast of a decided superiority were compelled on the morrow to flee with diminished

A.D. 1559.

May 18.

June 29.

1 "At length," says Knox, in a letter to Mrs. Anne Locke, "they were content to take assurance for eight days, permitting "unto us freedom of religion in the mean time. In the whilk the "abbay of Lindores, a place of black monkes, distant from St. "Andrewis twelve miles, we reformed; their altars overthrew we, "their idols, vestments of idolatrie, and mass books we burnt in "their presence, and commanded them to cast away their monk-"ish habits."—June 23, 1559. Apud M'Crie, 545. This was what he interpreted to be freedom of religion!

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

forces before a more powerful adversary. So it was on the present occasion. For some days the war was carried on by adverse proclamations, in which the queen had the advantage by detailing the excesses of her opponents, who had demolished the churches of the capital, burst by open force into the palace of Holyrood House, and carried away the bullion from the mint. Insensibly their numerous force dwindled away, while that of the regent increased; she hastily marched towards Edinburgh; "the saints" trembled before the congregation of Satan; a capitulation was signed; and Edinburgh was again occupied by the royalists. But the reformers, before their departure, published a false representation of the articles, calculated to keep alive the hopes and the violence of their disciples, by assuring them of freedom from molestation on the part of the government, but concealing from their notice the engagement that they themselves should also refrain from all those excesses against the churches and churchmen, which they had hitherto practised.[1]

July 24.
July 25.
July 26.

There was in these proceedings of the Scots as much perhaps of worldly policy as of religious fanati-

[1] Knox, 153. Leslie, 510. About this time, July 10, died Henry, king of France. The reader may peruse in Robertson's History of Scotland an elaborate statement of the conciliatory measures which he ascribes to that monarch, but which, he pretends, were exchanged after his death for others of a more hostile description by the ambition of the princes of Lorrain, such as the expedition under Elbœuf, and the attempted arrest of the earl of Arran, that by sending so illustrious a victim to the stake, they might strike terror into the minds of the reformers. Unfortunately the whole system is overturned by the despatches of Throckmorton; from which we learn that the expedition was prepared, and the arrest attempted by the orders of Henry himself, at the very time when Robertson represents the influence of the house of Guise as reduced to the lowest ebb.—Forbes, 97, 101, 118, 144, 148, 149.

cism. While Knox animated the zealots with promises of supernatural aid, Cecil had kept alive the hopes of the more cautious with the prospect of support from the English queen. Their first proceedings had answered his expectations; but their subsequent retreat from the capital, and the military preparations on the coast of France, convinced him that they must make their peace with Mary, unless they were powerfully supported by Elizabeth He applied to her in their favour, and to his surprise and distress found her irresolute. The queen hated the principles of Knox, and the fanaticism of his disciples;[1] she deemed it unworthy of a crowned head to foment rebellion among the subjects of a neighbouring and friendly sovereign; and she respected the oaths which she had so recently taken, to preserve the peace with the queen of Scots, and to refuse an asylum to all Scottish rebels and traitors. But the sophistry of Cecil had prepared answers to every objection. The queen of England had, he maintained, a better right to the superiority over Scotland, than Mary had to the possession of the Scottish crown; it was not a question between subjects and their natural prince, in which a foreign power had no right to interfere, but between vassals and the mesne lord, in which the superior was bound in honour and conscience to defend the liberties of the former against the tyranny of the latter. In the present case, however, self-preservation, a principle paramount to every other motive, concurred with the duty of Elizabeth. The French king looked on the queen as illegitimate, and esteemed his own wife the rightful heir to the English crown. Were he permitted to retain a footing in Scotland, Elizabeth could never enjoy security.

August 5.

[1] See note (D) at the end.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

Were he expelled by her aid, she would attach the Scots to her interests, and might despise the efforts of her enemies.[1] This appeal to her apprehensions and jealousy extorted from the queen a reluctant and qualified assent. To deceive the public, the earl of Northumberland, Sir James Sadler, and Sir James Croft, were appointed to reform the disorders in the Scottish marches. But the religion of Northumberland, who was a Catholic, rendered him unfit to be intrusted with the real object of the commission. His

August 8.

colleagues alone were admitted into the secret. They received instructions to urge the Scots to the resumption of hostilities, to supply them with money, to promise them every kind of aid which could be furnished without a manifest breach of the peace between the two queens, and to induce them, if it were possible, to depose Mary, and transfer the crown to the house of Hamilton.[2] The duke of Chastelhe-

[1] Though this may have been the first time that Elizabeth was urged to support the Scots, the connection between her ministers and the insurgents was so well known, that even in May and June we find Throckmorton mentioning "the queen's service in Scotland," and recommending persons, "as fit to serve the queen's turn "in Scotland."—Forbes, 101, 119, 147, 148.

[2] Sadler, i. 387—411. The most singular of these documents is one written by Cecil, as a "memorial of certain points meet for the "restoring of the realm of Scotland to the ancient weale." If Mary refuses certain demands which he specifies, the lords ought to commit the government to the next heir; and if she objects to that, "as "it is likely she will, then it is apparent that almighty God is pleased "to transfer from her the rule of the kingdom for the weale of it." He next observes, "that, when Scotland is once made free, means "may be devised through God's goodness to accord the two realms "to endure for time to come."—Sadler, i. 375—377. From this paper, dated August 5, it appears that he preferred the Hamiltons to the lord James. The same is more evident from the instructions given to Sadler. "You shall do well to explore the very truth, "whether the lord James do mean any enterprise towards the crown "of Scotland; and if he do, and the duke be found very cold in his "own cause, it shall not be amiss to let the lord James follow his

rault, indeed, the head of that house, had hitherto been faithful to the cause of his sovereign; but his weakness, inconstancy, and ambition were well known: there could be no doubt that his allegiance would yield to the temptation of a crown for his descendants; and with that view it was resolved to hasten the return to Scotland of his eldest son, now called the earl of Arran.

Arran, who had lately imbibed the new doctrines, served in the French army as colonel of the Scottish guards, and in that capacity was considered an honourable hostage of the loyalty of his father. Henry II. had summoned him to attend his duty at the intended marriages of the French princesses to the king of Spain and the duke of Savoy; but Arran, having sent an apology for his absence, suddenly disappeared, at the suggestion, it was believed, and with the aid of Throckmorton, the English ambassador.[1] It was in vain that the police endeavoured to trace the footsteps of the fugitive; Throckmorton's agents accompanied or followed him to Geneva, whence he wrote a letter expressive of his gratitude to the queen of England.[2]

May 30.

July 6.

"own desire therein, without dissuading or persuading him any "therein."—Apud Chalmers, ii. 410. Throckmorton had written to Cecil on the 27th of July, "that there was a party in Scotland "for the placing of that nobleman in the state of Scotland, and that "he himself did, by all the secret means he could, aspire thereunto." —Forbes, i. 180.

[1] This suspicion seems to have been well founded. Throckmorton repeatedly mentions it, but never so much as hints that it is false.—Forbes, i. 136, 164. Robertson, from De Thou, says it was intended to charge Arran with heresy; but the ambassador, though he speaks of the flight and pursuit of the earl on twelve different occasions, never once alludes to any such intention, but rather to a charge of treason (148, 217).

[2] Elizabeth was highly displeased. "It seemeth," she says, "very "strange that the earl of Arran maketh mention in his letters, that "he hath cause to thank us for the offers made to hym by us. We

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. From Geneva he came in great privacy to London, was admitted to a secret interview with Elizabeth, and to several conferences with Cecil, and then continued his journey in disguise, under the assumed name of Beaufort, till, with the assistance of Sadler and Croft, he reached his father's castle of Hamilton.

August 31.

Sept. 10.

Previously to his arrival, the English commissioners had successfully laboured to rekindle the flames of civil war. They had represented to the lords of the Congregation the justice of their cause, which had for its object, "to extirpe idolatrie, and delyuer their country "from foreign government;" the advantage they might derive from the willingness of the queen of England to afford them assistance; and the folly of postponing the attempt, till the regent should have acquired a decided superiority by the aid of her brothers of the house of Guise. At the same time the report, that it was intended to annex Scotland as a province to France, made a deep impression on the public mind; a promise of neutrality was obtained from the duke of Chastelherault; and several Catholic lords engaged to draw their swords in defence of the liberties of their country. A resolution was now taken to rise in arms, and to justify the measure by charging the regent with two breaches of the capitulation of Edinburgh: 1. By having ordered mass to be celebrated in Holyrood House; and 2. by having received reinforcements from France. At this moment, Arran, whose arrival

Sept. 8.

"be in doubt what to thynk; and do much mislyke that any such "occasion should be gyven by any manner of message done to "hym."—Forbes, i. 167. The indiscreet gratitude of the earl had nearly revealed to the queen the secret and unauthorized practices of her secretary. But what were these offers? If we may believe Persons (and the queen's words seem to support his assertion), that, in the event of success in the war against the queen regent, Elizabeth would marry Arran.—Philopater, p. 90.

had been hitherto concealed, made himself known. He was received with honours not due to a subject. His unexpected appearance, the report that he was the destined husband of the queen of England, and the seasonable distribution of two thousand pounds advanced by Sadler, elevated the hopes of the associated lords. On the other hand, the queen regent assumed a tone of confidence and superiority. She offered peace on the basis of real liberty of conscience, and summoned her opponents to meet La Brosse and the bishop of Amiens, who had been furnished with full powers for that purpose.[1] But at the same time she informed them of her resolution and ability to maintain the rights of her daughter, ordered the town and harbour of Leith to be fortified, and boasted of the veterans who had lately arrived under Octaviano, a Milanese adventurer, and of the still more numerous force which she expected under her brother, the marquess d'Elbœuf. Her offer was, however, rejected; the duke openly joined the Congregation; and the abbeys of Paislow, Kilwinning, and Dunfermlin, were dissolved. But the impatience of Sadler and Croft wished for open hostilities. They complained of the sluggishness of their confederates; and Knox, to aid their efforts, forged a letter from France to the lord

[1] La Brosse brought with him two thousand men: Pelvé was the name of the bishop. They were sent as advisers to the regent, who was ordered to follow their counsels. Hitherto she had been advised by D'Oyselles and Maitland.—D'Aubigné, i. 121. The object of their mission is thus explained by the cardinal of Lorrain. "They," the Congregationists, "went about of their own authorite to alter "religion, which being advertised by the quene regent, commissions "were sent to have the matter comme to debating and deciding; "because we were desirous to stay the mater without rigeur. But "they not onely neglected to come to reason, but refused t'intend to "the commission."—Forbes, i. 336. The offers of the queen, and the refusal of the lords, are mentioned in Sadler, i. 501, 502.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. — Oct. 18. James, prior of St. Andrew's, painting in the most vivid colours the danger of further procrastination.[1] At length the insurgents moved in considerable force towards Edinburgh, while the royalists retired within their intrenchments at Leith. In the capital two councils were formed, the one under the presidency of Chastelherault, for the despatch of political business, the other under that of Knox, for the regulation of spiritual concerns. The first pronounced it expedient, the second lawful, to take from the regent the exercise of her authority: her deprivation was proclaimed by sound of trumpet; and she herself, as well as her aiders and abettors, were declared enemies to the country. This was the first step towards the accomplishment of the plan devised by Cecil; the second, if no reverse had followed, would have been to disown the authority of the sovereign.[2]

Oct. 22.

The queen regent was still supported by the earl of Huntley, lord chancellor, by the earls Marischal and Bothwell, and by most of the bishops. Her force amounted to between two and three thousand veterans, Scots and Frenchmen, whose superior discipline and experience rendered them more than a match for the

1 At least Randall, the English agent in Scotland, believed it a forgery, "which I geese to savor to muche of Knox stile to come "from Fraunce, though it will serve to good purpose."—Sadler, i. 499. The prior of St. Andrew's was James Stewart, a bastard son of James V., by Margaret Erskine. He became an early proselyte to the reformed doctrines, and was created earl of Murray in 1562.

2 If the reader turn back to note (2), p. 34, he will see how exactly the insurgents had followed the directions of the English secretary. It appears from Knox that they intended to follow them to the end. He thus writes to Railton, one of the agents of the secretary: "She "is deprived of all authoritie and regiment among us.—The au- "thoritie of the French king and queene is yet receaved, and wilbe "*in wourde*, till thee deny our most just requeastes, which ye shall, "God willing, schortlie hereafter onderstand."—October 30, Sadler, 680.

bravery and enthusiasm of the ten thousand men, led by the chiefs of the Congregation, the duke, the lord James, and the earls of Arran, Glencairn, Cassilis, Monteith, and Eglinton. In an attack on the intrenchments at Leith, the latter were repulsed with some loss. Instead of condoling, Sadler and Croft rejoiced at their misfortune. "The affray," they exclaimed, "is begun: blood has at last flowed, and it "will be long before it can be stanched."[1] But in Knox and Cecil it created a well-founded doubt of the ultimate result. Knox, in the most urgent terms, demanded the aid of two thousand English troops; and, anticipating the objection which might be drawn from the existence of peace between the two crowns, suggested that they should serve as volunteers, in apparent opposition to the will of their sovereign, and under a sentence of outlawry and treason.[2] But Cecil, though he knew that "the Scots could clyme no walls,"[3] dared not recommend so hypocritical a measure. He served a mistress who, to use his son's expression, "if to-day "she was more than man, would to-morrow be less "than woman."[4] Elizabeth was imperious, but changeable; jealous of her own safety, but also jealous of her reputation; willing to injure, by every means in her power, a rival queen, but unwilling to be considered by the world as the abettor of insurrection and treason, and that too against a sovereign with whom she had just ratified for the second time a treaty of friendship

A.D. 1559

Oct. 25.

[1] Sadler, 514.

[2] Keith, App. 40. Cecil observes, with respect to this or some similar demand of Knox: "Surelie I lyke not Knoxees audacitie, "which also was well tamed in your answer. His writings doo no "good here; and therefore I doo rather suppress them: and yet I "mean not but that ye shuld contynue in sendyng them."—Sadler, i. 535.

[3] Ibid. 514.

[4] Nugæ Antiquæ, i. 345.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

and reciprocal assistance.[1] Hitherto, indeed, she had been induced to approve of his connection with the Scots; but it had required all the arts of the minister, all the intrigues of his confidential friends, to keep her steady to his purpose. Among these friends, the most useful was Throckmorton, the ambassador in France, who, by transmitting reports often apocryphal,[2] almost always exaggerated, and by suggesting as from himself to Cecil that advice which Cecil dared not openly tender to the queen, had succeeded in confirming her jealousy and keeping alive her apprehensions. Now

Sept. 24.

he solicited and obtained the permission to return home, ostensibly to visit his wife, who lay dangerously

Oct. 31.

ill, in reality to communicate to his sovereign secrets which he dared not commit to paper. What these secrets were, we shall learn hereafter; to Cecil it opened a new and cheering prospect; he held consultations with his friends in the council; and they succeeded in persuading the queen that most assuredly whenever the French should make an end with Scotland, they would begin with England. Was it not then her interest to oppose them now before it should be too late? By such reasoning she was drawn to con-

Nov. 12.

sent that Cecil should aid the lords of the Congregation not only with his advice, but also with money. For his greater security, she signed the warrant; and the few councillors who were in the secret witnessed her signature.[3]

[1] Rym. xv. 513. Crawford's Papers, i. 144.

[2] One of the reports, which made great impression, was, that a great seal for Scotland had been sent thither, quartering the arms of France, England, and Scotland with the style of Francis and Mary, king and queen of France, England, Scotland, and Ireland. It is, however, plain from his letters, that he had no certain knowledge that such was the fact.—Forbes, 229, 252.

[3] The witnesses were the earl of Pembroke, Lord Clinton, Lord

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

The next post, however, brought the most perplexing intelligence. The Scots had attacked the enemy near Restalrig. They were received with equal courage and superior skill, and, after a sharp skirmish, had fled into the city. Though their loss did not exceed a hundred men; though Knox had summoned them to the church to hear the "promises of God;" though the royalists had returned to their intrenchments at Leith; yet a sudden panic diffused itself through the capital: the pulpit of the apostle was deserted; the leaders shared in the consternation with their followers; and before midnight the road to Linlithgow was covered with fugitives of every description. The darkness added to their terrors; they persuaded themselves that the French gens d'armes were pursuing at their heels; nor did they slacken their speed till they had reached Stirling, a distance of thirty miles. Both saints and warriors were overwhelmed with shame and despondency; but Knox displayed his wonted confidence, and resumed the sermon which had been interrupted by their flight from Edinburgh. Why, he asked, had the army of God quailed before the uncircumcised Philistines? It was on account of their sins; of the ambition of this chieftain, of the avarice of another, of the lewdness of a third, and of the presumption and pusillanimity of all. But let them only turn to the Lord; let them acknowledge their sinfulness and in-

Nov. 6.

Nov. 7.

Howard of Effingham, Parry, Cecil, Petre.—Sadler, i. 566—573; and Wotton, ibid. note. Sadler had informed Cecil that the earl of Bothwell, the sheriff of the county of Edinburgh, had seized and carried off one thousand pounds which he had sent the lords of the Congregation, an offence which was never forgiven by his enemies. The secretary, aware of the parsimony of the queen, was careful to conceal the fact from her till she had signed the warrant. "Nevertheless," he adds, "hyr majestie shall knowe of the loss to-morrow, though it will be to sone."—Ibid.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559.

sufficiency; and the tribes of Israel would again prevail over the recreant Benjamites; the eternal truth of the eternal God would triumph over the efforts of idolatry and superstition. His eloquence rekindled the fanaticism and the hopes of his hearers; and the lords, though from the highest to the lowest they had individually smarted under the lash of his invective, tolerated the boldness of the apostle for the benefit of that influence which he exercised over their followers.[1]

This intelligence, though it checked the exultation, invigorated the efforts, of Cecil. After a struggle of two days, his influence in the English cabinet prevailed. The Scots were urged to proceed with their enterprise; they received promises of money to pay, and of officers to discipline, their forces; and were assured that a fleet should be equipped to intercept all communication between Leith and France, and that an army should be stationed on the borders to avail itself of the first favourable opportunity to espouse their cause. In return it was required that they should send to London an accredited agent with a petition for support, that the queen might afterwards have some instrument to produce in justification of her conduct.[2] The person chosen for this office was the younger Maitland, of Lethington, a statesman of great abilities, who had been secretary to the queen regent, but lately deserting to the Congregationists, had betrayed to them the secrets of his mistress. Maitland

Nov. 14.

Nov. 19.

[1] Knox, Historie, 194—197. Sadler, i. 554, 563. Randall complains greatly of the lords: "Syns the taking of the money, and "the commying of the Frenchmen to the gates of Edinburgh, I have "found the most parte of our nobles and others such, as I knowe "not whome woorthilie to commend."—Ibid.

[2] Sadler, i. 574—578, 581, 602.

came clandestinely to London, presented to Elizabeth a petition, which had been previously composed by Cecil and approved by herself,[1] and, when she asked him for a pledge of the fidelity of his employers, offered her the selection of six out of twelve hostages, the children of the first families in Scotland.

It chanced that one morning, at an early hour, Maitland was seen to enter the lodgings of Throckmorton. The circumstance awakened the suspicion of Gilles de Noailles, the French ambassador, who immediately demanded, both from the queen and from the council, an explanation of the warlike preparations in the river and in the northern counties. Elizabeth assured him of her determination to maintain the peace of Cateau; and as a proof of her sincerity, wished that the curse of Heaven might light on the head of that prince who

Dec. 20.

[1] Sadler, i. 569, 603. Several writers have given Maitland credit for the ability displayed in this paper; they little knew that it was in reality the composition of Cecil. This minister having communicated it to the queen, sent it to Sadler, with instructions to conceal the real author, and to induce the Scots, "by practice," to adopt it for their own. Aware, however, that Sadler might find it difficult to reconcile those passages which contained protestations of allegiance to Mary, with the known intention of the parties to deprive her of the crown, he observes, "The allowance of ther dutyes to the quen "is here thought necessary both for contentation of the world, and "for the honour of the quene's majestye; and therefore, whatsoever "the Scots may be compelled to do hereafter in that behalf, this "seemeth very probable for the present."—Ibid. 573. Sadler now began "to practice." He wrote a copy and showed it to Maitland as his own composition, when that envoy passed through Berwick on his way to London. He was induced to write it, he said, by his desire to aid the lords; and as he was well acquainted with the disposition of Elizabeth, he had hastily thrown together such arguments as he knew would make impression on her mind. Maitland, whether he suspected the artifice or not, admired the new petition, acknowledged that it was preferable to that which he had brought with him, sent it to the lords for signatures, and afterwards presented it to the queen.—Ibid. 603. Of this paper she afterwards made great use in her correspondence with the king of Spain, and probably with other powers.

CHAP. L A.D. 1559.

should be the first to violate it. The council replied, that Francis and Mary, by assuming the style and arms of England, had furnished ample ground for apprehension; and that while the French monarch continued to recruit his forces, both at home and in Scotland, they should be wanting in their duty if they did not advise the queen to prepare for the defence of her own dominions. Noailles, however, was not deceived. He denounced the hostile intention of the English cabinet to his sovereign, and to the queen regent of Scotland.[1]

The associated lords, encouraged by the sermons of Knox, and the assurances of Cecil, had called a general meeting at Stirling. But Stirling was suddenly taken

Dec. 27.

by a detachment from the garrison of Leith. Thence the royalists penetrated into Fifeshire, burning the houses, and ravaging the lands of their adversaries.

1560. Jan. 8.

The flames spread to Kinghorn, Kirkcaldy, and Dysart. Arran and the lord James were compelled to shrink from the approach of a superior enemy; and the repeated promises of succour from England, by daily adding to their disappointment, added to their distress. At length the royalists, followed at a distance by Arran, directed their march to St. Andrew's;

Jan. 23.

and were winding round the promontory of Kingcraig, when a fleet in the offing was descried advancing with crowded sails towards the shore. The two armies immediately halted: every eye was fixed on the sight; the Scots hailed the promised succours from England; their adversaries flattered themselves with the long expected arrival of d'Elbœuf from France. In a short time the nearest ships displayed the English colours; three small vessels belonging to the regent

[1] Forbes, 284. Haynes, i. 213.

were captured; and the guns of the fleet were pointed against the royalists. The latter immediately began to retrace their steps; and it is a proof of their superior discipline that, during a circuitous retreat of six days through a hostile country, they suffered but inconsiderable loss.[1] CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

Notwithstanding this act of hostility, Elizabeth affected great anxiety for the preservation of peace; and the task of vindicating the conduct of Winter, the English admiral, devolved on the duke of Norfolk, who now resided on the borders with the title of the queen's lieutenant in the north. Though Winter had sailed from the river for the express purpose of aiding the Scots,[2] and had taken on board six hundred arquebusiers to be opposed to the regular troops of the royalists, yet it was pretended that he had no other object than to convoy a fleet of victuallers to Berwick; that the violence of the weather had driven him into the Frith; and that the jealousy or the mistake of the French commanders who fired on him from the batteries at Leith, Brunt-island, and Inchkeith, had compelled him to make reprisals in his own defence. This specious but unfounded tale was even embodied into an official despatch, and authenticated by the signatures of the duke and his council.[3] Jan. 26. But Noailles was too well informed of the real fact; he exclaimed against so impudent a falsehood; and extorted from Cecil, after many delays and evasions,

[1] Sadler, i. 665—671, 674—679, 682—685, 690—703.

[2] For Winter's instructions, see Chalmers, 28.

[3] The signatures are of Tho. Norfolk, H. Westmorland, W. Dacre, T. Wharton, Raff. Sadleyr, F. Lecke.—Haynes, i. 231. In a private letter the duke acknowledges that the earl of Westmorland and the lords Wharton and Dacre were not in the secret, but supposed the account to be true.—Ibid. 233.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

a commission to inquire into the conduct of Winter.[1] The French court, however, thought it more dignified to be content with this appearance of justice, than to demand, without being able to enforce, satisfaction: the inquiry was dropped; the English fleet continued to ride triumphant in the Frith, and in the next month a treaty was concluded between the duke of Norfolk and the lords, by which the queen bound herself to aid the Scots with an army for the expulsion of the French force.[2]

Feb. 27.

The queen had been drawn into the contest step by step against her own judgment and inclination. At first she consented only to furnish money; then her fleet was sent into the Frith, but ostensibly for a legitimate purpose; next we shall see her condescending to that from which her pride had hitherto recoiled, and concluding a formal treaty with the subjects of another sovereign. The principal inducement was her knowledge of the projects cherished by the factious in France, and the attempt of Cecil to excite in that country dissensions similar to those which he had fomented in Scotland, by arming the princes of the

[1] This commission is directed to the duke of Norfolk, and expresses the queen's persuasion that Winter "wold not committ any "thing that shuld be any breach of the peace."—Ibid. 258. Throckmorton, on his return to France, acted with equal deceit. When the cardinal of Lorrain complained of Winter's conduct, "I pre- "tended ignorance, and said that if Mr. Winter did contrary to "th'amitye, he might be assured it was without your majestie's "commandement."—Forbes, i. 335. Cecil, in a memorial to the king of Spain, has recourse to a different falsehood. He thus accounts for the expedition under Winter, and the army formed under the duke of Norfolk: "Ut verum fateamur (omnesque qui hic sunt "norunt esse *verissimum*) nos diu dubitatione aliqua esse occupatos, "an hæc discordia in Scotia inter Gallos et Scotos esset ficta, ut sub "eo colore haberent in armis justum exercitum, et junctis utrinque "copiis irrumperent subito in hoc regnum, et præcipue caperent "Berwicum."—Forbes, i. 405.

[2] Keith, 117.

blood, and the reformers, against their new monarch, Francis II. By his instructions Throckmorton solicited a private interview with Antoine de Bourbon, the titular king of Navarre, who was known to favour the reformed doctrines. They met in the town of St. Denis at the hour of midnight. The ambassador, in general terms, stated to the king "the esteem of "the queen for his virtues, her wish to form an "alliance with him for the honour of God and the "advancement of true religion, and her hope that, by "mutually assisting each other, they might prevent "their enemies from taking any advantage against "God, or his cause, or either of themselves as his "ministers." Though Antoine understood the object of this hypocritical cant, he answered with caution: that he should be happy to have so illustrious an ally in so sacred a cause, but that for greater security he would correspond directly with the queen herself.[1] In a few days the young king intrusted to the duke of Guise and the cardinal of Lorrain, the uncles of his queen, the chief offices in the government. The ambition of the princes of the blood was disappointed; and Antoine, king of Navarre, and Louis, prince of Condé, Bourbons of the house of Vendôme, formed an association with Coligny, admiral of France, d'Andelot, colonel of the French infantry, and the cardinal of Châtillon, three nephews of the constable Montmorency. Together they could command the services of about three thousand men of family, and of the whole body of reformers in France, to whom they had long been known as friends and protectors. This was the important secret which Throckmorton would not

A.D. 1559. August 22.

[1] Forbes, i. 174, 213.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

commit to paper, but communicate in person to the queen; and he was followed by Renaudie, a gentleman of Périgord, the devoted partisan of the prince of Condé, who, to save the lives of the chiefs in the event of failure, had accepted the dangerous post of appearing at first as the leader of the insurgents. That adventurer soon returned, the bearer from Elizabeth of wishes for their success, and promises of support; Calvin from Geneva sent emissaries and letters to his disciples in France; men were secretly levied among the professors of the new doctrines in every province; and a day was appointed when they should rendezvous in the vicinity of the court, surprise the king and queen, the cardinal and the duke of Guise, and place the government in the hands of the princes of the blood.[1] It was at this moment that the duke of Norfolk received orders to conclude a treaty with the Scottish lords at Berwick. Though the French ambassadors offered to withdraw their forces from Scotland, with the exception of a few companies, and to refer the matter in dispute between the insurgents and their sovereign to the arbitration of Elizabeth herself, the duke was ordered to proceed; and it was stipulated that the queen should maintain an English army in Scotland till the French were expelled from that kingdom; and that the Scots should never consent to the union of their crown with that of France, should aid Elizabeth with four thousand men in the case of invasion, and should

Feb. 27.

[1] In the council held at La Ferté it was deliberated whether they should entirely rid themselves of the royal family and the Guises; but the majority decided that assassination would throw too much discredit on the party, and rouse all France against them.—Capefigue, ii. 107. He quotes Brulart's Journal. Vie de Coligny, 20. De Thou, l. xxiv. Matthieu, l. iv. p. 213. Le Laboureur, i. 512.

give her hostages for their fidelity to these engagements.[1] CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

In a few days the conspiracy in France burst forth, but was defeated at Amboise by the vigilance and vigour of the duke of Guise. Condé and Coligny, to escape suspicion, fought against their own party; Renaudie perished in the conflict, and most of the other leaders were taken and executed. At this intelligence Elizabeth began to waver; and her hesitation was kept alive by the arrival of Montluc, the French ambassador; but Throckmorton urged her not to forfeit the golden opportunity offered by the prospect of a civil war in France; and the lords of the March 23. council solicited permission to commence hostilities on the following grounds: because it was just to repel danger, honourable to relieve the oppressed, necessary to prevent the union of Scotland with France, and profitable to risk a small sum for the attainment of that which must afterwards cost a greater price.[2] The day after the presentation of this memorial appeared March 24. a most extraordinary state paper, entitled a declaration of peace, but intended as a justification of war. It made a distinction between the French king and queen and their ministers. The former were the friends of Elizabeth, who strictly forbade any injury to be offered to their subjects; the latter were her enemies; and to defeat their ambitious views she had taken up arms, and would not lay them down till she had expelled every French soldier from the realm of Scotland.[3] The duke of Norfolk, who had collected March 28.

[1] Haynes, 253.
[2] Forbes, i. 390—396.
[3] Haynes, i. 268. "It is a poor revenge," said the cardinal of Lorrain to Throckmorton, "that hath been used of late by your "proclamation in England against my brother and me; but we take

EX LIBRIS PROVINCIAE PRO STUDIO THEOL. S. S. CORDIS JESU.
585

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560. — April 6. March 29. April. May 6.

an army on the borders, committed it to the care of Lord Grey; the Scots and English joined; and the combined forces sat down before the entrenchments of Leith. But the operations of the siege were paralyzed by the irresolute and contradictory humours of the queen. She wrote to the generals to prefer negotiation to arms, rejected a new project of accommodation, permitted the French envoy to treat with the Scottish lords, ordered the siege to be pushed with vigour, and then reproached her ministers with having extorted her consent to that which she foresaw must end in failure and disgrace. Her predictions were verified The besiegers made their approaches without judgment; their batteries were ill-served and ill-directed; and when the assault was made, one of the storming parties lost its way, the other found the scaling-ladders too short. More than a thousand men perished in the advance and the retreat.[1]

This check put an end to the war. The queen applauded her own foresight; and though, after a stormy debate with the secretary, she consented to reinforce the army, she still insisted that he should proceed to Scotland, and extinguish by negotiation the flame which he had kindled. He submitted with an evil grace; and, having instructed his friends to watch the intrigues of his political adversaries during his absence, set out on his unwelcome mission, with Wotton for his colleague.[2] At Newcastle they joined the French

"it that it is not the queene's doing, but the perswasion of thre or "foure about her; and, as I trust to see shortlye that she woll be "better advised, so we hope that er it be long, she will put her hand "to punysh them for gyving her such advice."—Forbes, i. 423. The original of the proclamation is in Cecil's handwriting.

[1] See the official letters in Haynes, 283—388.

[2] See Cecil's letters in Forbes. "The queen's majestie renew-"eth the opinion of Cassandra—God trieth us with many diffi-

envoys, Randan and Montluc, and at Berwick signed a preliminary treaty. But by this time the royalists had suffered a severe loss in the death of the queen regent, a princess of distinguished talents and moderation, who had sacrificed the health of her body and the peace of her mind in support of the interests of her daughter. During her indisposition she was received within the castle of Edinburgh by the humanity of the lord Erskine, who held that fortress by a commission from the three estates, and professed to observe the most scrupulous neutrality during the contest. From her death-bed Mary sent for the chiefs of the two opposite parties, recommended to their care the weal of the kingdom, and the rights of the sovereign, and saluting each of the lords, and giving her hand to the commoners, she publicly forgave every injury which she had received, and asked forgiveness of those whom she had offended. The next day she expired, regretted by the Catholics and the royalists, and esteemed by her very opponents. Knox alone was found to pour the venom of his slander over her grave.[1]

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

May 30. June 11.

April 4.

June 10.

June 11.

The French commissioners had been empowered to

"culties. The queen's majestie never liketh this matter of Scotland; "you know what hangeth thereuppon. Weak hearted men and "flatterers will follow that way—I have had such a torment therein "with the queen's majestie as an ague hath not in five fits so much "abated—What will follow of my going I know not; but I fear the "success, quia the queen's majestie is so evil disposed to the "matter."—Forbes. i. 454, 455, 456, 460, 500. The lord John Grey fears the influence of the Philippians during the absence of Cecil. By Philippians he means Arundel, Parry, Petre, and Mason (Haynes, 251); but Killygrew pronounces them all honest men, with the exception of Mason. Pembroke and Clinton support Cecil. —Forbes, i. 501. They were called Philippians, because Philip had remonstrated with Elizabeth on her disgraceful conduct, in aiding the rebels of another prince.—Forbes, i. 402. Haynes, 281.

[1] It is not easy to explain how Robertson (i. 139, edit. 1791) could misinterpret, as he has done, the expressions of Leslie in describing the death of the queen.—Leslie, Hist. 525.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560. grant an amnesty to the insurgents, provided they would return to their duty. The offer was accepted; but at the same time demands were made which, while they left a nominal superiority to Francis and Mary, tended to transfer the exercise of the royal authority to the lords of the Congregation. At first, Montluc and Randan defended with spirit the rights of the crown; but necessity compelled them to submit to more than their powers would justify; and it was ultimately agreed, that after the removal of the French troops, with the exception of a small garrison in Dunbar, and another in Inchkeith, a convention of the three estates should be held, in virtue of a commission to be sent from the king and queen; that out of twenty-four persons named by the convention, the queen should select seven, the estates five, to be intrusted with the government of the realm; that none but natives should hold the great offices of the crown; that the king and queen should not declare war nor conclude peace without the consent of the estates; that neither the lords of the Congregation, nor their followers, should be molested for the part which they had taken; and that the churchmen should be protected in their persons, property, and rights, and should receive redress for their previous losses, according to the award of the estates in parliament. To these conditions was appended a demand that the new worship should be established. But on this point the commissioners refused to yield; Cecil himself condemned the fanaticism of the zealots; and it was reserved for Maitland to pacify them with a promise, that a deputation, named by the convention, should lay this request before Francis and Mary.[1]

July 6.

[1] Keith, 131—144. "Our travail is more with the lords of

At the same time another treaty was in progress between the French and the English commissioners. A.D. 1560. The evacuation of Leith, and the removal of the foreign troops, offered no difficulty; but Cecil demanded the restoration of Calais as an indemnity for the injury offered to Elizabeth by the assumption of her title; and, moreover, an express ratification of the treaty lately concluded at Berwick between the duke of Norfolk and the Scottish insurgents. On these questions much diplomatic finesse was displayed; and the conferences were repeatedly interrupted and resumed, till at length, by mutual concession, a treaty was concluded. Francis and Mary were made to promise that, as the English and Irish crowns belonged of right to Elizabeth, they would cease to bear the arms, or use the style of England and Ireland; the question of compensation was referred to the equitable decision of the king of Spain; and it stipulated that, as the French king and queen had made several concessions to their Scottish subjects, at the petition of the English queen, so they should ratify those concessions, whenever the Scots themselves had fulfilled the conditions on which they had been granted.[1] July 6.

Thus terminated the war of religion in Scotland; a war which reflected little credit on the arms of Elizabeth, and still less on the character of her advisers. The right of intervention, even in its most liberal acceptation, can never authorize one prince to intrigue

"Scotland than with the French. I find some so depely perswaded "in the matter of religion, as nothing can perswade them that may "appear to hynder it. My lord of Lidyngton (Maitland) helpeth "much in this, or els surely I see folly would hazard the whole." —Haynes, i. 333. See note (E).

[1] Rym. xv. 593. Haynes, i. 354.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

clandestinely with the subjects of another, and to induce them, by the offer of assistance, to rebel against their sovereign at a time when he has bound himself by oath to live in perfect amity with that sovereign, and to refuse every kind of aid, secretly or openly, to his enemies.[1] Elizabeth was aware of the moral turpitude of such policy; she shrunk from the course of falsehood and dissimulation which it entailed upon her; and, though for a while she suffered her better judgment to be subdued by the sophistry and predictions of Cecil, she eagerly seized, as we have seen, the first opportunity supplied by a slight reverse before the walls of Leith, and compelled him to visit the scene of hostilities, that he might devise some effectual plan of accommodation. If that minister set out on his mission with reluctance, he discovered on the spot that he could easily obtain by peace the very object which he had sought by war. It was plain to him that the religious excitement of the reformers would trample under foot every engagement imposed upon them by the presence of the foreign armies. Nor was he deceived. The French and English forces were withdrawn from Scotland; and a convention of the estates, in which the Congregationists, by the attendance of many of the lesser barons, possessed an overwhelming majority, assembled in Edinburgh without waiting for the commission from their sovereign. Not merely religious freedom, but religious domination, was the first object to claim their attention. 1. An act was passed to abolish the papal jurisdiction in Scotland, and to provide punishment for any man who should presume to act under it. 2. The administration of baptism after the Catholic rite, and the celebra-

August 1.

[1] See the treaty, art. 1, 2, 3. Rym. xv. 513.

tion of mass in public or private, were prohibited under the penalty, both to the minister who should officiate, and to the persons who should be present, of forfeiture for the first offence, of banishment for the second, and of death for the third. 3. A confession of faith, framed by Knox and his associates after the Genevan model, was approved, and every existing law incompatible with the profession of it was repealed. 4. Every member of the convention, who refused to subscribe to the new creed was instantly expelled; an ingenious device to refuse justice to those Catholics who under the late pacification claimed compensation for their losses during the war. After the exclusion, the names of the complainants were twice called; neither they nor their attorneys were present to support their claims; and it was declared that "the lordis "and nobilitie had don thair duetie conform to the "articles of the peax."[1] 5. The earls of Morton and Glencairn, with secretary Lethington, were commissioned to wait on the English queen, and to propose to her, in the name of the estates, a marriage with the earl of Arran, son to the presumptive heir to the Scottish crown; a measure probably suggested to them by Cecil, as we know it to have been a favourite project which he had long laboured by every artifice in his power to accomplish.[2]

With an account of these proceedings, and the names of four-and-twenty persons out of whom, according to the treaty, the Scottish queen might choose

[1] Keith, 151, 488. Thus was accomplished the prophecy of Cecil, that the "reparation would be light enough."—Haynes, 356. They had made their claims and solicited an answer during thirty-three days.—Keith, ibid.

[2] Knox, 239, 254, 255. Spottis. 150. Art. Parl. Scot. ii. 525. App. 605.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560. seven of the twelve members of the council, Sir James Sandilands, a Knight of Malta, proceeded to the French court. The mission of a single knight to Mary, in contrast with the mission of two earls to Elizabeth, was taken for a studied insult; and the enactments of the convention, in contradiction to the articles of pacification, were not likely to be graciously received. When Throckmorton required that Mary and her husband Francis should ratify the treaty, they replied Nov. 17. that their Scottish subjects had fulfilled no one of their conditions of the accord; that they had acted as if they formed a republic independent of the sovereign; that Elizabeth continued to support them in their disobedience; and that she had already broken the ancient treaty, by admitting into her kingdom, and into her presence, the deputies of the convention, without the previous consent of their sovereign.[1]

In less than a month, Francis, a weak and sickly Dec. 5. prince, died of an imposthume in the ear. By this event, the near connection between France and Scotland was dissolved; and, as the dangers, conjured up by the jealousy of Cecil, had now vanished, Mary persuaded herself that she might assume without molestation the government of her native kingdom. Such, however, was not the design of the English ministry. They were aware that she might marry a second time, and that with a new husband her former pretensions might revive, a contingency against which it was their duty to provide. With this view a resolution was taken to prevent, or at least to retard, the return of Mary Stuart to Scotland. Winter continued to 1561. March 17. cruise in the Frith; and Randolph, the English agent,

[1] Hardwicke Papers, i. 126, 129. Wright's Elizabeth, i. 50—54. See Note (F).

received instructions to remind the lords of the Congregation of their obligations to Elizabeth; to advise the conclusion of a perpetual league with England during the absence of the queen; and to suggest a form of association, which should have for its chief object to compel her to marry one of her own subjects.[1] Elizabeth had no reason to complain of the backwardness of the Scots; Chastelherault, Argyle, Morton, and Glencairn, made to her the tender of their services; Maitland promised to betray to Cecil the plans and motions of Mary and her friends; and the lord James, having proceeded to France to assure his sister of his attachment and obedience, on his return through England advised Elizabeth to intercept her on the sea and to make her a prisoner.[2] With these noblemen loyalty and morality appear to have been empty names. Personal interest was their sole object, and in pursuit of this they cared little whether they served their sovereign or her adversary. CHAP. A.D. 1561. April 4. May 4.

Mary had been left a widow at the age of eighteen. She spent the winter among her maternal relatives in Lorrain, and consoled her grief by writing elegies on her departed husband. But the English envoys, the earls of Bedford, Mewtas, and Throckmorton, allowed her little respite with their repeated demands of the ratification of the treaty. To all she made the same reply; that since the death of Francis, her uncles had refused to give her advice, that they might not be said to interfere in the concerns of Scotland; that on a subject which so deeply affected the rights of her crown and her people, she could not be expected to Jan. 5. Feb. 19. April 13. June 23.

[1] Haynes, 366. Keith, 156. App. 94.
[2] Camden, i. 83. Keith, 163. App. 91. Chalmers, from letters in the State Paper Office, ii. 288.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1561.

answer without the aid of official advisers; but that, on her return to her dominions, she would consult the estates, and do whatever they should judge reasonable. These refusals irritated Elizabeth; they confirmed the suspicions, which had been previously suggested by her counsellors; and when D'Oyselles requested permission for Mary to pass through England to Scotland, she refused in a tone of vehemence, and with expressions of reproach, which betrayed the exacerbation of her mind.[1] Throckmorton soon afterwards waited on the Scottish queen to justify the conduct of his sovereign. When Mary saw him, she ordered her attendants to retire; "that," said she, "if like the queen "of England I cannot command my temper, I may at "least have fewer spectators of my weakness." To his reasons she replied: "Your mistress reproaches me "with my youth—it is a defect which will soon be "cured—but she might reproach me with my folly, if, "young as I am, without husband or council, I should "take on myself to ratify the treaty. When I have "consulted the estates of my realm, I will return a "reasonable answer. I only repent that I had the "weakness to ask of your sovereign a favour which I "did not want. I came here in defiance of Edward VI.: "I will return to Scotland in defiance of his sister. I

June.

July 20.

[1] "Many reasons moved us to myslike her passadg, but *this only* "served us for answer, that the Queen's Majestie would forbear to "shew her such pleasure, untill she shuld ratefy the last peace "made in Edenburgh."—Cecil to Sussex, 25 July, 1561. "So "many reasons have induced us to deny the request, that I think it "shall be of the wise allowed, and of our friends in Scotland most "welcome." These reasons were, "that the very expectation of th "queen's coming had erected up Huntley, Bothwell, Hume, and her "other friends, and the longer her affairs should hang in uncertainty "the longer it would be ere she should have such a match in marriage "as might offend the English court."—July 14, 1561. Hardwicke Papers, i. 172, 173.

"want nothing of her but her friendship; if she choose, "she may have me a loving kinswoman, and a useful "neighbour; for it is not my intention to intrigue "with the discontented in her kingdom, as she in- "trigues with the discontented in mine."[1]

The resolution of the Scottish queen triumphed over the tortuous policy of the English cabinet. Letters in the name of Elizabeth had been sent to the lords of the Congregation, admonishing them of the danger to which they would be exposed by the return of their sovereign, and advising them to divert her from her purpose, by some bold demonstration of their hatred to popery, and the renewal of their league with England;[2] and at the same time to alarm the Scottish queen, a squadron of men-of-war was collected in the Downs, for the special purpose, as was pretended, of cruising against pirates in the narrow seas. Mary was not ignorant of the intrigues in Scotland, and suspected the object of the naval armament; still she determined to brave the danger; and when Throckmorton waited on her before her departure, said to him, "I trust that I shall not need to "come to the coast of England. If I do, then, Mr. "Ambassador, the queen, your mistress, will have me

June 30.

[1] Keith, 162—177. Cabala (edit. 1663), p. 374—379.

[2] Camden, 82. Cecil's letter may be seen in Mr. Stephenson's collection of documents under the title of "Illustrations of the Reign "of Queen Mary," p. 89. "I have shown," says Randolph, "your "honour's letters unto the Lord James, Lord Morton, Lord Liding- "ton. They wish, as your honour doth, that she might be stayed "yet for a space; and if it were not for their obedience sake, some "of them care not, though they never saw her face. Lidington "findeth it ever best that she come not; but, if she do come, to let "her know at the first what she shall find, which is due obedience "and willing service, if she embrace Christ, and desire to live in "peace with her neighbours."—Robertson, App. vol. i. No. v. Lidington's answer is in Keith, App. 92.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1561. "in her hands to do her will of me; and if she be so "hardhearted as to desire my end, she may do her "pleasure, and make her sacrifice of me. Peradven- "ture that might be better for me than to live. In "this matter God's will be done."[1] Having spent a few days with the royal family at St. Germain en
August 11. Laye, she proceeded to Calais in great state; whence she despatched a messenger to Elizabeth with her answers to the demands made by Throckmorton. She does not appear to have waited for any reply from the
August 15. English queen, but sailed from Calais in a few days, with two galleys and four transports, and accompanied by three of her uncles, and many French and Scottish noblemen. As long as the coast remained in view, she fixed her eyes on the land, in which she had lived from her childhood, and had reigned as queen; then, stretching out her arms, exclaimed, "Farewell, be- "loved France, farewell. Never shall I see thee "more." The next day a thick fog arose,—a pro- pitious circumstance; for though the English admiral fell in with the squadron, though he captured one of the transports carrying the earl of Eglinton, and searched two others laden with the queen's trunks and effects, he did not discover, or could not overtake the
August 19. galleys.[2] On the fourth day, Mary approached the

[1] Keith, 176.

[2] What secret instructions he had received, we know not; for those in Haynes (p. 366), to which reference has been sometimes made, regard a different matter, and were signed in January preceding. But his hostile conduct, joined with the known anxiety of the English cabinet to prevent Mary's arrival in Scotland, make it highly probable that, as was then believed, he had been instructed to intercept her on the sea, and, under some pretext or other, to bring her to England. Cecil, on the 12th of August, wrote to the earl of Sussex, that there were "three ships in the north seas. to preserve "the fishers from pyratts. *I thynk they will be sorry to see her* "(the Scottish queen) [illegible]ss"—words evidently meant to prepare

land of her fathers with mingled emotions of hope and apprehension. To disappoint the machinations of her enemies, she had arrived a fortnight before the appointed time. No preparations were made for her reception, but the whole population, nobles, clergy, and people, poured to Leith to testify their allegiance to their young and beautiful sovereign. Her fears were dispelled: with a glad and lightsome heart she mounted her palfrey; and entered the capital amidst the shouts and congratulations of her subjects. It was to her a day of real joy and happiness; perhaps the only one that she was destined to experience in Scotland.[1] That very evening she was compelled to listen to hundreds of zealots assembled to chant psalms under her window; and the next morning, still more unpleasant forebodings were suggested to her by the frenzy of the populace, who attempted to murder one of her chaplains under the designation of a priest of Baal. Claiming for herself the right of worshipping according to her conscience, she established the Catholic service in her own chapel; but a Sunday or two afterwards, "the earl of Argyle and the lord James "so disturbed the choir, that some, both priests and "clerks, left their places with broken heads and

CHAP. I. A.D. 1561. — Sept. 14.

him for the expected result. But as the attempt did not succeed, it was necessary to deny it. Elizabeth wrote to Mary, that she had sent a few barks to sea, not "to preserve the fishers," but to cruise after certain Scottish pirates, at the request of the king of Spain (Keith, 181, 182; Robertson, App. vii.), and Cecil wrote to Throckmorton, "that the queen's majesty's ships that were on the seas, to "cleanse them from pirates, saw her and saluted her galleys; and "staying her ships, examined them gently. One they detained as "vehemently suspected of piracy."—Hardwicke Papers, i. 176. The men who fabricated so many falsehoods to conceal the object of Winter's expedition to the Frith, could easily fabricate others to excuse their uncourteous conduct to the Scottish queen.

[1] Camden, i. 82. Leslie, 585. Goodall, i. 175.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1561.

"bloody ears."—"It was," adds the English envoy, "sport alone for some that were there to behold it."[1]

Before I conclude this chapter, I may call the attention of the reader to the private history of Elizabeth in the commencement of her reign. Her repeated asseverations that she preferred the state of celibacy to that of marriage obtained but little credit. Under her sister such language might be dictated by policy; at present it might serve to free her from the addresses of those whom she disliked. But no man would believe that she spoke her real sentiments; and there were many, both among foreign princes and native subjects, whose vanity or ambition aspired to the honour of marrying the queen of England.

1559. Ja. 10.

1. Of foreign princes the first was Philip of Spain. His ambassador, the conde de Feria, received orders to make the proposal within two months after her accession. The queen was flattered but perplexed. She remembered, with thankfulness her former obligations to Philip; and was aware, that with him for her husband, she had no reason to fear the exertions of France in favour of Mary Stuart. But, on the other hand, her confidential advisers reminded her of her former disapproval of the marriage between him and her sister Mary; they objected his suspicious temper, and intolerant zeal in favour of the religion which she meant to abolish; they contended that his

[1] Brantome, 123. Randolph in Keith, 190. Knox maddened the zeal of his disciples by his prayers for her conversion from idolatry, and the strengthening of the hearts and hands of the elect. —Id. p. 197. "It began to be called in question, whether that the "princesse, being an idolater, might be obeyed in all civile and polli- "tique actions."—Id. p. 202. "Upon Allhalowe daye the Quene "had a songe masse: that night one of her prestes was well beaten "for hys rewarde by a servant of the lord Robert's."—Nov. 4. Wright's Eliz. i. 85.

power was rather nominal than real, and argued that, since he was related in the same degree of affinity to her, as Henry VIII. had been to Catherine, she could not marry him without acknowledging that her mother had been the mistress, not the wife of her father. At first the queen had replied to the ambassador, that, if she made up her mind to marry, she would prefer Philip to any other prince; but at his second audience requested to be excused on account of the impediment arising from Philip's former marriage with her sister.[1] Still the opponents of the match were apprehensive of the result. But they urged in parliament the projected measures for the abolition of the Catholic worship; and Philip, who had made its preservation an indispensable condition, turned his eyes towards Isabella of France, by whom his offer was accepted. When the announcement was made to the queen, she felt, or pretended to feel hurt, and complained to the ambassador of the precipitancy of his master, who could not wait four short months, but must take at once an evasive answer for a positive refusal. But the Spanish king was a wooer from policy. He preferred to the uncertain issue of his suit the solid advantages which he extorted from the anxiety of the French cabinet to prevent his union with the queen of England.[2]

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. — 1560. Jan. 19. Feb. 17. April 17.

2. The place of Philip was supplied by his cousin Charles of Austria, son to the emperor Ferdinand.[3] The family connections of this prince promised equal support against the rivalry of Francis and Mary; to

[1] Dixo que pensaba estar sin casarse, per que tenia mucho escrupelo en lo de la dispensa del Papa.—Feria to Philip, Memorias, 264, 265.

[2] From the documents at Simaneas, and Camden, i. 28, 30.

[3] Jewell to Bullinger, May 22, 1559. Burnet, iv. 552.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

his person, talents, and acquirements, no objection could be adduced; but his religion opposed, if not in the opinion of the queen, at least in that of her counsellors, an insuperable obstacle to his suit. Elizabeth's vanity was indeed flattered, and she intimated a wish to see the archduke in England. It was generally understood that he had resolved to visit his intended bride under an assumed character; and in foreign courts, an idea prevailed that the marriage was actually concluded; but the emperor conceived it beneath his dignity to proceed with so much precipitancy, and opened a negotiation, which defeated his own purpose. Though he was induced to withdraw his first demand of a church for the celebration of the Catholic service in London; though he consented that Charles should, on occasions of ceremony, attend the queen to the Protestant worship; still he insisted that his son should possess a private chapel for his own use, and that of his Catholic family. To this it was replied, that the laws of the realm allowed of no other than the established liturgy; and that the conscience of the queen forbade her to connive at the celebration of an idolatrous worship. So uncourteous an answer cooled the ardour of the young prince; the emperor demanded a positive answer; and the queen replied that she had in reality no wish to marry. Charles immediately turned his attention towards the widow queen of Scotland; and the subject was dropped without any expression of dissatisfaction by either party.[1]

1559. November.

1560. Jan. 20.

3. While the Austrian was thus preferring his suit, arrived in England, John, duke of Finland, to solicit

1559. Sept. 27.

[1] Camden, 53. Strype, i. 150. Haynes, 216. Memorias, vii. 278.

the hand of the queen for his brother Eric, king of Sweden.[1] He was received with royal honours, and flattered with delusive hopes. To the queen he paid incessant attention, sought to win the good will of her favourites by his affability and presents, and as he went to court, usually threw money among the populace, saying that he gave them silver, but the king would give them gold. To Eric, a Protestant, no objection could be made on the ground of religion; finding, however, that his suit made little progress, he grew jealous of his brother, and, recalling him, confided his interests to the care of an ambassador. At the same time he sent to Elizabeth eighteen piebald horses, and several chests of bullion, with an intimation that he would quickly follow in person to lay his heart at her feet. The queen had no objection to the present; but, to relieve herself from the expense and embarrassment of a visit, she requested him, for his own sake, to postpone his journey till the time when she could make up her mind to enter into matrimony.[2] At length his patience was exhausted; and he consoled himself for his disappointment by marrying a lady who, though unequal in rank to Elizabeth, could boast of superior beauty, and repaid his choice by the sincerity of her attachment.[3]

CHAP. I. A.D. 1559. Oct. 5. 1561. Oct. 3. 1562. January.

[1] Suecus et Carolus Ferdinandi filius mirificissime ambiunt. Sed Suecus impensè. Ille enim, modo impetret, montes argenteos pollicetur. Sed illa fortasse *thalamos propiores* cogitat.—Jewell to P. Martyr, 2 Nov. 1559. Burnet, v. 562.

[2] Suecus diuturnus procus, et valde assiduus, nuper admodum dimissus est.—Jewell to P. Martyr, 7th Feb. 1562. Burnet, iv. 568.

[3] Sadler, i. 507. Hardwicke Papers, i. 173, 174. Camd. i. 67. Strype, i. 192—194, 234, 236. The whole court was thrown into confusion in September, 1561, by the intelligence that he was actually on his voyage. The instructions issued in consequence are amusing.—See them in Haynes, i. 370.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1562.

4. Jealousy of the power of Eric had induced the king of Denmark to set up a rival suitor in the person of Adolphus, duke of Holstein. The prince was young, handsome, and (which exalted him more in the eyes of Elizabeth) a soldier and a conqueror.[1] On his arrival he was received with honour, and treated with peculiar kindness. He loved and was beloved.[2] The queen made him knight of the Garter; she granted him a pension for life; still she could not be induced to take him for her husband.

1560. March 20.

5. While Charles, and Eric, and Adolphus thus openly contended for the hand, or rather the crown, of Elizabeth, they were secretly opposed by a rival, whose pretensions were the more formidable, as they received the united support of the secretary and of the secretary's wife.[3] This rival was the earl of Arran, whose zeal for the glory of God had been stimulated with the hope of an earthly reward in the marriage of the queen. During the war of the Reformation he had displayed a courage and constancy which left all his associates, with the exception, perhaps, of the lord James, far behind him; and, as soon as the peace was concluded, he presumed to apply for the expected recompense of his services. To the deputies of the Scottish convention, who urged his suit, Elizabeth, with her usual affectation, replied, that she was content with her maiden state, and that God had given her

October.

[1] Dithmarsis nuper debellatis.—Camd. i. 69.

[2] So I conclude from Peyto's letter to Throckmorton. "There "goeth a whisperyng that he is a sueter, and as the Italian saeth, "molto amartellato. If the fyrst be avowable, I doubt not of the "last; for it is a consequent of force respecting the parties; as youe, "I dare say, will agree therein with me."—Forbes, i. 443, May 9, 1560.

[3] See the letters to her from Maitland, Melville, and Arran, in Haynes, 359, 362, 363.

no inclination for marriage. Yet the sudden departure of the ambassadors deeply offended her pride. She complained that, while kings and princes persevered for months and years in their suit, the Scots did not deign to urge their requests a second time.[1] As for Arran, whether it were owing to his disappointment or to some other cause, he fell into a deep melancholy, which ended in the loss of his reason. A.D. 1560.

From foreign princes we may turn to those among the queen's subjects, who, prompted by their hopes, or seduced by her smiles, flattered themselves with the expectation of winning her consent. The first of these was Sir William Pickering. He could not boast of noble blood; nor had he exercised any higher charge than that of a mission to some of the petty princes of Germany. But the beauty of his person, his address, and his taste in the polite arts, attracted the notice of the young queen; and so lavish was she of her attention to this unexpected favourite, that for some weeks he was considered by the courtiers as her future consort.[2] But Pickering was soon forgotten; and, if disparity of age could have been compensated by political experience and nobility of descent, the earl of Arundel had a better claim to the royal preference. For some years that nobleman persevered in his suit, to the disquietude of his conscience and the disparagement of his fortune. He was by persuasion

[1] Keith, 154—156. Haynes, 364.

[2] Vulgi suspicio inclinat in Pickerinum, hominem Anglum, virum et prudentem et pium et regia corporis dignitate præditum.—Jewell to Bullinger, 22nd May, 1559. Burnet, iv. 552. He was in so great favour with the queen, que se negociaban a 25 por 100 las apuestas de que saria rey.—Don Alvarade Quadra, Bp. of Aquila, in a letter to Philip, May, 1559. Quadra had been added to the embassy Nov. 25, 1558, and on the recall of Feria on May 8, 1559, was left resident ambassador.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

a Catholic, but, to please the queen, voted in favour of the reformation; he possessed considerable estates, but involved himself in debt by expensive presents, and by entertainments given to his sovereign and her court. When at length he could no longer serve her politics, or minister to her amusements, she cast him off, and treated him not only with coldness, but occasionally with severity.[1]

The man who made the deepest and most lasting impression on her heart, was the lord Robert Dudley, who had been attainted with his father, the duke of Northumberland, for the attempt to remove Elizabeth as well as Mary from the succession. He had, however, been restored in blood, and frequently employed by the late queen; under the present he met with rapid preferment, was appointed master of the horse, and soon afterwards, to the surprise of the public, installed knight of the Garter. The queen and Dudley became inseparable companions. Scandalous reports were whispered, and believed at home; in foreign courts it was openly said they lived together in adulterous intercourse. Dudley had married Amy, the daughter and heiress of Sir John Robesart; but that lady was not permitted to appear at court; and her lord allotted for her residence a lonely and unfrequented mansion, called Cumnor, in Berkshire. In

1559. December.

[1] He was forty-seven years old at the queen's accession. From papers in Haynes (364, 365) it appears that he was the great rival of Dudley. If we may believe a note, preserved by Camden in his corrected copy of his Annals, the earl introduced the use of coaches into England. In 1565 he travelled to the baths at Padua for relief from the gout. Afterwards he fell into disgrace for his participation in the design of marrying the duke of Norfolk to the queen of Scots; and from that time till his death (Feb. 28, 1580), was almost always confined by order of the council to his house; not, as far as appears, for any real offence, but as a dangerous person, on account of his opposition to the designs of the ministers.

this secluded situation she was afflicted in the spring of 1559 with a painful complaint in the chest; and it was openly said that Dudley waited only for her death to accomplish his marriage with the queen. Amy, however, recovered to disappoint that hope, if he really entertained it; but her sudden death in the following year provoked a more injurious suspicion, that his impatience of waiting had prompted him to make away with his wife.[1] To silence such reports, some judicial investigation, probably a coroner's inquest, was ordered; and the result was, a declaration that the death of Lady Dudley had been the effect of accident. Immediately the report of the marriage revived; it was believed that the queen had solemnly pledged her word to Dudley; and even a lady of the bed-chamber was named as witness to the contract.[2] Parry, the treasurer of the household, declared in its favour; and Cecil and his friends, though they condemned the measure, had not the courage to express their disapprobation. As a last resource, they

1560. September

[1] Lever, one of the preachers, wrote to Knollis and Cecil to make inquiry into the matter, because, "here in these partes seemeth "unto me to be a grevous and dangerous suspition and muttering "of the deaeth of her that was the wife of my lord Robert Dudlie." —Haynes, 362. Throckmorton also wrote to Cecil, "The bruits "be so brim, and so maliciously reported here, touching the mar- "riage of the lord Robert, and the death of his wife, that I know "not where to turn me, nor what countenance to bear."—Hardwicke Papers, i. 121. "I assure you, sir, thies folks are brode "mowthed, where I speke of oon to much in favour as they "estem. . . . To tell you what I conceyve, as I count the slawnder "most false, so a young princess canne not be to ware."—Chaloner to Cecil, Dec. 6, 1559. Haynes, 212. See also Memorias, 282, 283, 284.

[2] Mary Stuart, detailing the report of Lady Shrewsbury, writes to Elizabeth: Qu'un, auquel elle disoit que vous aviez faict promesse de mariage devant une dame de vostre chambre, avoit cousché infinies foys auvecques vous avec toute la licence et privaulté, qui se peut user entre mari et femme.—Murdin, 558.

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560. trusted to the ingenuity of Throckmorton, who undertook the delicate and hazardous office. He did not, indeed, open his mind to his sovereign as he had done to Cecil; but he adopted the safer expedient of attributing his own sentiments to others, and then communicated them to Elizabeth, as a painful duty imposed on him by the charge which he held. With this Nov. 27. view, his secretary Jones came to England, and obtained permission to detail to the queen in private the real or pretended remarks of the Spanish and Venetian ambassadors respecting her projected union with Dudley, and the infamous character of that nobleman. She listened to the messenger with patience, sometimes bursting into a laugh, sometimes covering her face with her hands. In conclusion, she told him that he had come on an unnecessary errand; that she was already acquainted with everything that he had said; and that she had convincing proof of the innocence of her favourite in regard to the reported murder of his wife.[1] What impression this conference may have made on her mind, is unknown; Dudley was not to be diverted from the object of his ambition; and it was probably to rebut the common objection derived from the inequality of rank between a sovereign and her subject, that he sought to interest Philip of Spain in his

[1] See the letters of Jones in the Hardwicke Papers. As to the death of Lady Dudley, she said, "that he was then in the court, and "none of his at the attempt at his wife's house; and that it fell out "as should neither touch his honesty nor her honour."—Ibid. 165. Six months after this conversation, Cecil ordered Throckmorton to send over a French goldsmith, with aigrettes, chains, bracelets, &c., to be bought by the queen and her ladies; on which he observes: "What is meant in it, I know not; whether for that *which many* "*look for*, or the coming in of the Swede; but, as for me, I can see "no certain disposition in her majesty for any marriage; and any "other likelihood doth not the *principal* here find, which causeth "him to be perplexed."—Hardwicke Papers, i. 172.

favour. He repeatedly visited the ambassador Quadra, and after the death of Quadra, his successor, Gusman de Silva, explained to them how he would mitigate the sufferings of the English Catholics, if he were married to the queen; and solicited them to draw, if it were possible, from the Spanish monarch, some direct or indirect approval of his suit. It does not appear that Philip vouchsafed to return an answer.[1]

CHAP. I. A.D. 1560.

[1] From the despatches at Simancas in 1561, 1562, 1564. See Gonzales, Apuntamentos, 36, 41, 57.

CHAPTER II.

ELIZABETH AIDS THE FRENCH HUGUENOTS—PROCEEDINGS OF PARLIAMENT—PENAL STATUTES AGAINST CATHOLICS—THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES—PACIFICATION IN FRANCE—RETREAT OF THE ENGLISH—ELIZABETH PROPOSES TO MARY STUART TO MARRY DUDLEY—SHE MARRIES DARNLEY—ELIZABETH FIXES ON THE ARCHDUKE CHARLES FOR HER HUSBAND—REJECTS HIM—ASSASSINATION OF RICCIO—BIRTH OF JAMES—PETITION TO ELIZABETH TO MARRY—HER UNINTELLIGIBLE ANSWER—ASSASSINATION OF DARNLEY—TRIAL AND ACQUITTAL OF BOTHWELL—MARRIAGE OF MARY WITH BOTHWELL.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1560.

IN the preceding chapter, I have noticed the commencement of that connection, which, after the death of Henry II., subsisted between the English government and the Huguenots of France.[1] The failure of the attempt to surprise the court at Amboise had broken their projects; and the origin of the conspiracy was clearly traced to the king of Navarre and his brother the prince of Condé. An unexpected event not only preserved these princes from punishment, but revived and invigorated their hopes. Dec. 6. Francis II. died, and the queen mother, Catherine of Medicis, being appointed regent during the minority of her son Charles IX., sought their aid to neutralize

[1] There have been several fanciful derivations of the word Huguenot. It is now supposed to have been originally "eidgenossen, or "associated by oath," the name assumed by the Calvinistic party in Geneva during their contest with the Catholics. From Geneva missionaries penetrated into the south of France, and took with them the appellation of Egnots or Huguenots.

the ascendancy of the house of Guise. The prince of Condé was released from prison, and admitted into the council; his brother, the king of Navarre, obtained the office of lieutenant-general of the kingdom. The queen's next object was to pacify, if she could not unite, the two great religious parties which divided the population of France. In this she was ably seconded by the chancellor De l'Hospital; and the edict of January, 1562, both suspended the execution of all penal laws on the score of religion, and granted to the Calvinists ample liberty for the exercise of their worship. But the minds of men were too fiercely exasperated by mutual injuries to listen to the voice of moderation. Nothing less than the extirpation of what they termed idolatry could satisfy the fanatics among the reformers; and by the zealots of the opposite party the smallest concession to the new religionists was deemed an apostasy from the faith of their fathers. It was impossible to prevent these factions from coming into collision in different places; riots, pillage, and bloodshed were generally the consequence; and the leaders on both sides began to prepare for the great conflict which they foresaw, by associations within, and confederacies without, the realm. On the one hand Condé, Coligny, and D'Andelot, encouraged by the advice of the English ambassador Throckmorton, who continually urged them to draw the sword against their opponents,[1] claimed pecu-

A.D. 1560.

1562. Jan. 17.

[1] Throckmorton informs us, in one of his letters, that the duke charged him to his face with being "the author of all the troubles;" and therefore required him "to help to bring them out of trouble, "as he had helped to bring them into it." In his answer the ambassador did not venture to deny the charge.—Forbes, ii. 255, 257. . . . . "Nos divisions, lesquelles Trokmorton avoit fomentées et "entretenues longuement par la continuelle fréquentation et intel- "ligence qu'il avoit avec l'admiral et ceux de son parti. . . . . il fit

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562. niary and military aid of Elizabeth, and despatched envoys to levy reisters and lansquenets among their fellow religionists in Germany; on the other, Montmorency, the duke of Guise, and the marshal St. André entered into a solemn compact to support the ancient creed by the extirpation of the new doctrines; solicited for that purpose the co-operation of the king of Spain, and sought to draw to their party the Lutheran princes of Germany. At first the queen regent, more apprehensive of the ambition of the duke of Guise than of that of the prince of Condé, had offered to the latter the support of the royal authority; but the king of Navarre had been gained over to the Catholic cause; Catherine and her son were conducted by him April. from Fontainbleau to Paris; and from that hour they made common cause with those among whom fortune rather than inclination had thrown them. In a short time the flames of war burst out in every province in France. If the lieutenant-general secured Paris for the king, the prince of Condé fortified Orleans for the insurgents. Each party displayed that ferocious spirit, that thirst for vengeance, which distinguishes civil and religious warfare: one deed of unjustifiable severity was requited by another; and the most inhuman atrocities were daily perpetrated by men who professed to serve under the banners of religion, and for the honour of the Almighty.[1]

"entrer sa maitresse en cette partie, dont elle m'a souvent dit "depuis, qu'elle s'estoit repentie, mais trop tard."—Castelnau, Mém. xliv. 50.

[1] The French reformed writers generally ascribe the war to an affray, commonly called by them the massacre of Vassy, in which about sixty men were slain by the followers of the duke of Guise. But, 1. there is every reason to believe that this affray was accidental, and provoked by the religionists themselves.—See La Popelin, l. vii. 283, and the declaration of the duke on his death-bed, preserved by Brantome, who was present both at Vassy and at his death.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562.

Though the Calvinists were formidable by their union and enthusiasm, they did not form more than one hundredth part of the population of France.[1] Still the prince cherished strong hopes of success. He relied on the resources of his own courage, on the aid of the German and Scottish Protestants, and on the promises of Throckmorton. His envoys, the Vidame of Chartres, and De la Haye, stole over to England, visited Cecil in the darkness of the night, and solicited from the queen a reinforcement of ten thousand men, with a loan of three hundred thousand crowns.[2] When the parsimony of Elizabeth shrunk from such unexpected demands, Throckmorton was employed to stimulate the royal mind with letters of the most alarming tendency. Cecil maintained to her that the ruin of Condé would infallibly be followed by her own deposition; and, what probably weighed more with the queen than the alarm of the ambassador, or the predictions of the secretary, her favourite Dudley aided their efforts by his prayers and advice.[3] A treaty

March 15.

July 2.

2. The affray happened on March 1, yet the Calvinists at Nismes began to arm on the 19th of February at the sound of the drum. They were in the field, and defeated De Flassans on March 6th.—See Menard, Histoire de Nismes, iv. preuves, 6.

[1] Castelnau, iv. c. 2.

[2] There is in Forbes an enigmatical letter to the prince, in which, to disguise the real subject, he is designated as the nephew, the queen as the aunt, the war is an action at law, a body of one thousand men a document to be exhibited in court, &c.—Forbes, ii. 35.

[3] The secretary attempted to prove his assertion in the following manner. If Condé was subdued, the duke of Guise would make an alliance with the king of Spain; the son of the latter would then marry the queen of Scots; the next step would be to proclaim Mary Stuart queen of England, with an understanding that Philip should have Ireland as an indemnity for the expense of sending an army to enforce her right. Lastly, the Council of Trent would excommunicate all heretics, and give away their dominions; and of course the English Catholics would join the invading army. Such were the visionary evils with which he sought to alarm the mind of his sovereign.—See Forbes, ii. 5.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562. was formally concluded between the queen of England, the ally of Charles, and the prince of Condé, a subject in arms against that sovereign. But, if she engaged to advance the sum of one hundred thousand crowns, and to land an army of six thousand men on the coast of Normandy, she was, at the same time, careful to require from him the surrender into her hands of the town of Havre de Grace, to be detained by her as a security, not only for the repayment of the money, but also for the restoration of Calais.[1]

Sept. 20.

The conferences between Cecil and the Vidame did not escape the notice of the French ambassador. With the treaty of Cateau in his hand, he demanded, in conformity with the thirteenth article, that the agents of the prince should be delivered up as traitors to their sovereign; and warned the queen that, according to the tenth article, she would forfeit, by the first act of hostility, all claim to the recovery of Calais at the expiration of the appointed term. But his remonstrances were disregarded. A fleet sailed to cruise off the coast of Normandy; successive flotillas carried six thousand men to the ports of Havre and Dieppe, which had been delivered to the queen; and the new earl of Warwick, the brother of the lord Robert Dudley, was appointed commander-in-chief of the English army in France.[2]

Oct. 3.

Notwithstanding this hostile interference, Elizabeth affected to maintain the peace between the two crowns, and to feel a sincere affection for her good brother, the young king of France. To the natives of Normandy she had declared by proclamation, that her only object was to preserve them, as she had lately

Sept. 24.

[1] Forbes, ii. 48. Thuan. ii. 198, 294.
[2] Ibid. 58—80. Strype, i. 328.

preserved the people of Scotland, from the tyranny of the house of Guise;[1] and when the French ambassador, in the name of his sovereign, required her to withdraw the army, she refused to believe that the requisition came from Charles himself; because it was, she said, the duty of a king to protect his subjects from oppression, and to accept with gratitude the aid which might be offered him for that purpose. A.D. 1562. Oct. 25.

Such miserable and flimsy sophisms could not cover the real object of the English cabinet; and the prince began to be considered, even by his own followers, as a traitor to his country. The duke of Guise had expelled the English from the last stronghold which they possessed in France; the opponent of the Guises had recalled them into the realm, and given them two seaports in place of the one which they had lost. Fired with resentment, the nobility hastened to the royal army from every province of France; and to animate their exertions, Charles, the queen regent, Sept. 18. and the king of Navarre repaired to the camp before Oct. 15. Rouen. Though the latter was mortally wounded in the trenches, the siege was still urged with vigour;

[1] Forbes, ii. 79. To this and similar invectives against the house of Guise, the duke contented himself with the following reply:—"Monsieur l'ambassadeur, it seemethe the queene your mistres, by "the publication of suche thinges as she doeth sette furthe in printe, "dothe bestowe her whole displeasure and indignation uppon me "and my house. I will alledge at thys tyme nothing for our def- "fence; but desyre you to saye that, besydes it is an unusual "manner for princes thus to treate persons of qualitie and respect, "by diffamatorie libelles and writings, we have had the honour, by "marriage, to make alliance with the house of England, whereof "she is descended; so as she cannot dishonour nor discredit us, "but it must touche herselfe, consydiring we are descended out of "her house, and she from ours; by the tyme, peradventure, she "shall have passed more years in the worlde, she will more respect "them that have the honour to be allyed to her, than she doethe "nowe."—Forbes, ii. 258.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562. — Oct. 26. the obstinacy of the governor refused every offer of capitulation; two hundred Englishmen, who had been sent to his support, perished in the breach; and the city was taken by assault, and abandoned, during eight days, to the fury of a victorious soldiery.[1]

Oct. 30. The English ministers now began to fear the resentment of their own sovereign, and committed to her favourite Dudley the unwelcome task of acquainting her with this loss. For a while he suppressed the intelligence, and prepared her mind, by hinting at unfavourable rumours in the city, and representing the fall of Rouen as a probable consequence of her procrastination and parsimony. The queen did not suspect the artifice. When the truth was disclosed to her, she took all the blame upon herself; and in the fervour of her repentance, despatched reinforcements to the earl of Warwick, commissioned Count Oldenburgh to levy twelve thousand men in Germany, and ordered public prayers during three days to implore the blessing of Heaven upon her cause, and that of the Gospel.[2]

Nov. 3.

The superior force of the royalists had compelled Condé to remain an unwilling spectator of the siege of Rouen; the arrival of six thousand mercenaries, raised

[1] La Noue says only three days; which meant, according to the laws of war in those times, un jour entier pour butiner, un autre pour emporter, et l'autre pour composer.—Mém. tom. xlvii. p. 131.

[2] Forbes, ii. 133, 165, 169—188. "I have somewhat prepared "the way with her," says Dudley in a letter to Cecil (October 30), "touching this great loss at Roan, in this sort: saing, ther was a "bruyt com, that ther was lately a tyrrible assault geven to yt, in "such sort as yt was greatly dowted the loss thereof. I pityed "withall, yf yt shuld be so, the scant credytt and lyttle regard was "had at the begining, whan yt might hav safely bin defended. I "perceave by her marvelous remorce, that she had not dealt more "frankly for yt—repentyng the want of ayde very much, and wold "neds now send forthwith to help them; for as yet she knoweth "not the loss of yt."—Forbes, ii. 155.

in the Protestant states of Germany, by the joint efforts of D'Andelot and Wroth, the English commissioner, enabled him to move from Orleans, and to menace Paris. The hopes of the English queen revived; though the promptitude with which the prince listened to the overtures of the French cabinet might have taught her to question his fidelity. This negotiation was, however, interrupted by the more intractable spirit of Coligny; and at Dreux, on the bank of the Dure, was fought a battle, more memorable for the fate of the adverse generals than for the number of the slain. The constable, who commanded the royalists, and Condé, who commanded the insurgents, were reciprocally made prisoners; and thus, by the chance of war, the chief power among the one party was concentrated in the duke of Guise and his adherents, the most violent of the Catholics; while among the other it fell into the hands of the admiral Coligny and his followers, the most bigoted of the Huguenots. The victory was won by the duke; Coligny retired to his intrenchment at Orleans, and by letters and messengers conjured the queen of England to send the supplies, to which she was bound by treaty.[1]

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562. Nov. 8. Nov. 16. Dec. 11. Dec. 19.

There was never, perhaps, a sovereign more reluctant to part with money than Elizabeth. Notwithstanding her engagements to the prince, her remorse for past delay, her resolutions of amendment, not a single crown had yet been advanced; at last the mutinous clamour of the German auxiliaries, the prayers of the admiral, and the representations of her advisers, wrung

[1] Forbes, ii. 195—203, 209, 217, 226, 251. Mém. de Castelnau (Coll. Petit.) xxxiii. 241. The duke of Guise, because the other party called it his "quarrel," commanded his own troop of horse only; the events of the battle threw the whole command into his hands (245).

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563. from her an order for payment;[1] but not till she had obtained from her parliament a grant of a subsidy upon land, and of two tenths and fifteenths on moveables. The argument on which this demand was founded was the old tale of the inveterate enmity of the house of Guise. They had originally sought, it was said, to deprive the queen of her crown by annexing Scotland to France; they now proposed to effect the same object by annihilating the reformers abroad, and employing conspirators in England. The first plan the queen had defeated at her own expense; the second she trusted to defeat, if her faithful subjects would supply her with means. The vote appears to have passed both houses without opposition.[2]

Feb. 15.

Feb. 19.

The conspiracy, to which allusion has been made, was a wild and visionary scheme, supposed to have been devised by two brothers, the nephews of the late Cardinal Pole. Considering themselves as lineal descendants of the duke of Clarence, brother to Edward IV., they aspired to that rank in the state to which they conceived themselves entitled by birth. For several weeks during the last autumn, Elizabeth had been confined to her chamber by the small-pox; many unfounded reports were circulated, among the rest a pretended prophecy that she would not outlive the month of March. The Poles determined to quit the realm, with the intention, in the event of the queen's death, of landing a body of men in Wales, and proclaiming Mary Stuart her successor. They had formed a notion that their promptitude, if it proved successful, might obtain, from the gratitude of that princess, her hand for the one, and the title of Cla-

[1] Forbes, ii. 247, 264, 272, 274, 297, 301, 322, 334.
[2] D'Ewes, 60, 84.

rence for the other. Having communicated their plan to the French and Spanish ambassadors, they prepared for their departure; but their secret had been betrayed, and both were apprehended. For some months a veil of mystery was drawn over their project; and the people were alarmed with the report of a conspiracy against the life of the queen and the reformed worship. As soon as the Commons had voted the requisite supply, the two brothers were arraigned, and condemned on the confession of Fortescue, their associate. If there was anything illegal, there was nothing formidable in their design; and the queen, after a short delay, granted them a pardon.[1]

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562. October. 1563. Feb. 26.

But this session of parliament, the second in Elizabeth's reign, is chiefly distinguished by an act highly penal against the professors of the ancient faith. By the law, as it already stood, no heir holding of the crown could sue out the livery of his lands, no individual could obtain preferment in the church, or accept office under the crown, or become member of either university, unless he had previously taken the oath of supremacy, which was deemed equivalent to a renunciation of the Catholic creed. It was now proposed to extend to others the obligation of taking the oath, and to make the first refusal an offence punishable by premunire, the second by death, as in cases of treason. The cause assigned for this additional severity was the necessity of "restraining and correcting the

[1] Strype, i. 327, 333. I almost think that this was nothing more than an imaginary plot to keep alive the irritation of the queen against the house of Guise, and her inclination to favour the projects of the French Protestants. "Contynew," says Cecil to Throckmorton, "your wryting to putt the quene's majeste in remembrance "of her perrill, if the Guises prosper."—Forbes, ii. 1. "The Poolés "and Fortescugh ar in the Tower, who had intelligence with the "Guises to have attempted high treason."—Id. p. 186.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563.

"marvellous outrage and licentious boldness of the "fautors of the bishop of Rome." But it met with considerable opposition from many Protestants, who questioned both its justice and its policy; its justice, because the offence was sufficiently punished by privation of office and property; and its policy, because where the number of non-conformists is great, extremity of punishment is more likely to provoke rebellion than to secure obedience. In the house of Lords it was combated in a forcible and eloquent speech by the viscount Montague. Where, he asked, was the necessity for such a law? "It was known to "all men, that the Catholics had created no disturb- "ance in the realm. They disputed not: they preached "not: they disobeyed not the queen: they brought "in no novelties in doctrine or religion." Then, could there be conceived a greater tyranny, than to compel a man, under the penalty of death, to swear to that as true which in his conscience he believes to be doubtful? Now, that the right of the queen to ecclesiastical supremacy must appear to many men doubtful, was evident from this, that though enforced by law in England, it was contradicted by the practice and opinion of every other nation, whether reformed or unreformed, in Christendom. Let then their lordships beware how they placed men under the necessity of forswearing themselves, or of suffering death, lest, instead of submitting, they should arm in their own defence; and let not the house, in making laws, permit itself to be led by the passions and rapacity of those "who looked to wax mighty and of power, "by the confiscation, spoil, and ruin of the houses "of noble and ancient men."[1]

[1] Strype, i. 259—273.

After a long struggle, the bill was carried by the efforts of the ministers, but with several provisions, exempting the temporal peers from its operation, and protecting from forfeiture the heirs of the attainted. Still it extended the obligation of taking the oath to two classes of men not contemplated in the original act; 1. To the members of the house of Commons, to schoolmasters, private tutors, and attorneys; and 2. To all persons who had ever held office in the church, or in any ecclesiastical court, during the present, or the last three reigns; or who should openly disapprove of the established worship, or should celebrate, or hear others celebrate, any private mass; that is, in one word, to the whole Catholic population of the realm. As to the first class, it was enacted in their favour, that the oath could be tendered to them but once; and of course they were liable only to the lesser penalty of forfeiture and perpetual imprisonment; but to those of the second class, it was to be tendered twice; and for the second refusal the offender was subjected to the punishment of death, as in cases of high treason.[1] It is manifest that if this barbarous statute had been strictly carried into exe-

[1] St. 5 Eliz. c. 1. Cecil to Sir Thomas Smith (February 27) admits the extreme rigour of these laws, but adds, "such be the humours "of the Commons house, as they thynk nothing sharp ynough ageynst "papists." To account for such "sharpness," Mr. Wright refers us to a paper in Strype (i. 375), which, however, is dated April 13 of the following year, stating that it was resolved at Rome "to grant a "pardon to any that would assault the queen, or to any cook, brewer, "baker, vintner, physician, grocer, chirurgeon, or of any other call-"ing whatsoever, that would make her away. And an absolute "remission of sins to the heirs of that party's family, and a per-"petual annuity to them, and to be of *the privy council* to whomso-"ever afterwards should reign." This was sent from Venice by one Dennum, who had gone to Italy as a spy, and pretended that he had procured the information by bribery. The absurdity of the tale can be equalled only by the credulity of those who believe it.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563.

cution, the scaffolds in every part of the kingdom would have been drenched with the blood of the sufferers; but the queen was appalled at the prospect before her; she communicated her sentiments to the metropolitan; and that prelate, by a circular but secret letter, admonished the bishops, who had been appointed to administer the oath, to proceed with lenity and caution; and never to make a second tender, till they had acquainted him with the circumstances of the case, and had received his answer. Thus, by the humanity or policy of Elizabeth, were the Catholics allowed to breathe from their terrors; but the sword was still suspended over their heads by a single hair, which she could break at her pleasure, whenever she might be instigated by the suggestions of their enemies, or provoked by the real or imputed misconduct of individuals of their communion.[1]

Jan. 12.

According to ancient custom, the convocation had assembled at the same time with the parliament. The matters submitted to its deliberations were of the highest importance to the newly established church; an adequate provision for the lower order of the clergy, a new code of ecclesiastical discipline, and the promulgation of a national creed, the future standard of English orthodoxy. The two first were opposed and prevented by the avarice and prejudices of the courtiers, who sought rather to lessen than increase the wealth and authority of the churchmen; to the third, as it interfered neither with their interests nor their pleasures, they offered no objection. The doctrines formerly published by the authority of Edward VI. furnished the groundwork of the new creed; several omissions and amendments were made; and the

[1] Strype's Parker, 125, 126.

Thirty-nine Articles, as they now exist, received the subscriptions of the two houses of convocation.[1] This important work was accomplished in a few days, and, as far as appears, without any considerable debate; but the subsequent proceedings supply a memorable instance of the inconsistency into which men are frequently betrayed by change of situation. None of the members could have forgotten the persecution of the last reign; many had then suffered imprisonment or exile for their dissent from the established church. Yet now, as if they had succeeded to the infallibility which they condemned, they refused to others that liberty of religious choice which they had arrogated to themselves. Instead of considering the Thirty-nine Articles as merely the distinguishing doctrines of the church recently established by law, they laboured to force them upon the consciences of others. To question their truth they deemed a crime; and had their efforts proved successful, every dissenter from the new creed would have been subject to the penalties of heresy.[2] But the design was opposed and defeated by the council. Such a law was thought unnecessary, as

Jan. 22.
Jan. 29.

[1] Wilkins, Con. iv. 232. Strype, i. 280, 290. See Note (G).

[2] It was proposed, that "whosoever should preach, declare, write, "or speak any thing in derogation, depraving, or despising the said "book (containing the articles) or any doctrine therein contained, "and be thereof lawfully convicted before any ordinary, he should "be ordered as in case of heresy, or else should forfeit one hundred "marks for the first offence, four hundred for the second, and all his "goods and chattels, with perpetual imprisonment, for the third."—Strype, 282. This was adopted by the lower house, and transmitted to the higher, but with a blank for the punishment, to be afterwards filled up. Another clause was subsequently suggested, that "if any person whatsoever should deny, directly or indirectly, "publicly or privately, by writing or speaking, any article of doctrine "contained in the book, and be thereof lawfully convicted before the "ordinary, and obstinately stand in the same, he should be——."—Wilkins, iv. 241. Strype, 302.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562.

far as regarded the Catholics, since they could at any moment be brought to the scaffold, under the Act of Supremacy; and it was inexpedient with respect to the disciples of the Genevan divines, whom the queen sought to allure by indulgence, rather than to exasperate by severity.

The hope of recovering Calais was one of the chief baits by which the queen had been drawn into the war between the French Huguenots and their sovereign. Her ministers had predicted the restoration of that important place; the prince of Condé had promised to support her demand with his whole power; and the admiral, when he received the subsidy, confirmed the engagement made by the prince.[1] Within a few weeks it was seen how little reliance could be placed upon men who fought only for their own emolument. While the admiral gave the plunder of Normandy to his German auxiliaries, the royalists

1563.

formed the siege of Orleans, the great bulwark of their opponents. Its fall was confidently anticipated,

Feb. 18.

when Poltrot, a deserter from the Huguenot army, and in the pay of the admiral, assassinated the duke of Guise.[2] The death of that nobleman was followed by a sudden and unexpected revolution. Condé aspired to the high station in the government to which he was entitled as first prince of the blood; and the Catholics feared that the English, with the aid of Coligny, might make important conquests in Normandy. The leaders

March 6.

on both sides, anxious for an accommodation, met, were reconciled, and subscribed a treaty of peace, by

[1] Forbes, ii. 394. Castelnau, 250.

[2] The two apologies of Coligny prove that if he did not instigate the assassin, he knew of, and connived at, the intended assassination.—See Petitot's collection, xxxiii. 281.

which the French religionists promised their services to the king, as true and loyal subjects, and obtained in return an amnesty for the past, and the public exercise of their religion for the future, in one town of every bailiwic in the kingdom,[1] with the exception of the good city of Paris. This pacification was eagerly accepted by the gentlemen, the followers of Condé: it was loudly reprobated by D'Andelot, the ministers, and the more fanatic of the party.

Elizabeth received the intelligence with surprise and anger. In her public declarations, she had hitherto professed to hold the town of Havre in trust for the king of France; but now, when he required her to withdraw her forces, she replied that she would continue to hold it, as a security for the restoration of Calais.[2] The French government assured her of their intention to surrender that place at the expiration of the appointed term, and of their willingness to ratify a second time the treaty of Cateau; they would even give her additional hostages, and place in her hands the bonds of the French king, and of the princes of the blood.[3] Briquemont was moreover sent by the prince of Condé, and Robertot by the king, with an offer to repay all the money which the queen had advanced to the insurgents.[4] But she continued inexorable, till she saw that both parties, the Huguenots as well as the Catholics, had determined to unite and expel the English troops from the soil of France. She then receded from her former pretensions, and Throckmorton was despatched to present, in union with Smith, the resident ambassador, a new project on her part. But he came

April 30.

May 7.

June 26.

[1] Forbes, 339, 350—359. Castelnau, 233, 240—245.
[2] Forbes, 405, 409.
[3] Ibid. 411, 435, 442.
[4] Mém. de Condé, iv. 518. She had sent 100,000 crowns to the admiral as lately as March 15.—Murdin, 754.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563. too late. The siege of Havre had been formed: Throckmorton, under pretence that he had no regular

July 18. permission, but in reality to prevent him from renewing his former intrigues, was arrested and thrown into prison;[1] and the audience demanded by Sir Thomas Smith was indefinitely and unceremoniously postponed. In a few days two breaches were made in the

July 25. walls; the garrison, reduced by the ravages of a most virulent disease, was unable to support an assault; and the earl of Warwick surrendered Havre to its

July 28. rightful sovereign, on condition that he might return with his forces to England.[2]

Elizabeth was now doomed to pay the penalty of her bad faith. To obtain the liberty of Throckmorton she placed De Foix, the French envoy, under restraint at Eaton; but the French cabinet refused to acknowledge the mission of Throckmorton, and, by way of retaliation, confined Smith in the castle of Melun.

August 30. The release of De Foix was followed by that of the

Oct. 26. two Englishmen; and the queen, dissembling her resentment, renewed their powers and instructions. But the proposal of peace which they made was re-

[1] Camden, 100. Throckmorton's intrigues with the French Calvinists were so well known, that they exposed him to frequent insults from the people of Paris, on which account he had been recalled at his own request, and that of the queen mother.—Forbes, ii. 2, 8, 25. But, on his road to Bourges to take leave, he was—by his own contrivance according to Camden (97)—made prisoner by the prince of Condé (September 1, 1562), with whom he resided as confidential agent till the battle of Dreux (December 19), when he fell into the hands of the duke of Guise, and by him, after a month's detention, was allowed to return to England.—Forbes, ii. 37, 251, 306. Within a few days he made his way back to France, the bearer of three hundred thousand crowns from Elizabeth to the admiral. February 18, 1563.—Ibid. 334.

[2] Forbes, 420, 466, 477, 496. Strype, i. 329. Mém. de Vieilleville, c. xxvii.—xxix. For the operations of the siege, see Castelnau, xliv. 52—57; Mém. de Condé, tom. iv. 560; Discours au vrai de la reduction du Havre de Grace; De Thou, ii. 351.

ceived with the most contemptuous indifference; five months were suffered to elapse before they could obtain a satisfactory answer; and, when at last the conferences were opened, though Smith experienced the usual treatment of an ambassador, Throckmorton was never admitted into the presence of the king or of his mother. No mention was made of the restitution of Calais to England. The one party would not suffer it; the other dared not urge it, because it was plain from the treaty of Cateau that Elizabeth had forfeited her claim to the recovery of the place, by landing a hostile army in France.[1] But she still had in her power the French hostages, and their bonds for the sum of five hundred thousand crowns; and after a long discussion it was agreed that the hostages should be exchanged for Throckmorton; and that the queen should be content to receive payment of one-fourth of her original demand.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1564. April 1. April 11.

It was with pain that the haughty mind of Elizabeth submitted to conditions so humiliating, and so contrary to her previous expectations.[2] In her interview with Castelnau she had the weakness to betray her feelings, to the amusement of that ambassador and of his court. She declared, at first, that she would never accept of such a peace, but rather perpetuate the war; then she would make her commissioners pay with their heads for their presumption in exceeding their powers; afterwards she would approve the treaty, but through no other motive than respect and attachment to her dear brother and sister, the king of France and the queen mother. In conclusion, she gave her ratification

[1] Rymer, xv. 509.

[2] "Inwardly to me and other her counsellors she showed much mislykyng."—Wright, i. 172.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1564.

and her oath. Charles received from her the order of the Garter; and in return, that of St. Michael was bestowed on two Englishmen, the duke of Norfolk, at the nomination of Elizabeth, and the lord Dudley, her favourite, at the nomination of the French monarch.[1]

Here we may return to the transactions between the English and Scottish queens. When Mary took possession of her paternal throne, she was aware that from France, distracted as it was by civil and religious dissension, she could derive no support; and therefore had determined, with the advice of her uncles, to subdue by conciliation, if it were possible, the hostility of her former opponents. The lord James, her bastard brother, and Maitland, the apostate secretary, both high in the confidence of the Congregationists, and both pensioners of the English queen, were appointed her principal ministers;[2] the friendship of Elizabeth was sought by compliments and professions of attachment; and an epistolary correspondence was established between the two queens, between their re-

[1] Rymer, xv. 640—648. Castelnau, Mém. lxiv. 100—105. Elizabeth, however, did not resign her claim to the restitution of Calais. At the expiration of the eight years Sir Thomas Smith, in April, 1567, appeared at the sea-gate, and demanded by trumpet the restoration of the place. On the refusal of the governor, he proceeded to the court. The speeches on both sides are recorded by Camden, but a second refusal was returned, and the English queen submitted to the disappointment.—Strype's Smith, 95. Camden, 144.

[2] Cecil to Sussex, October 7. It has been said that the lord James was always ready to betray the secrets of his sister to Elizabeth; and there is good reason to believe the charge, from many passages in the letters of Randolph, particularly in that of the 19th of June, 1563 (Keith, 241); and another from Throckmorton, quoted by Mr. Tytler, vi. 258. The same has also been objected against Maitland. I observe, however, that if in his correspondence with Cecil, he appears anxious to obtain the favour of the English queen, he also advocates the cause of his sovereign with the earnestness and ability of a faithful servant.

spective minions, as they were called, the Lord Robert Dudley, and the Lord James Stuart, and between the English and Scottish secretaries, Cecil and Maitland. It was a distinguishing trait in the character of Mary that she speedily forgot every injury. If we believe those who were not likely to be deceived, her friendship for Elizabeth was, or soon became, sincere;[1] while the English queen found it a difficult task to divest herself of her jealousies and prejudices against one whom she still regarded as a competitor for her crown. On this account she continued to insist that Mary should ratify the treaty of Leith, particularly that article which not only recognised the right of Elizabeth, but also precluded the Scottish queen from assuming the arms or title of England. To the first of these points Mary offered no objection; but she contended that to assent to the second would be a virtual renunciation of her birthright, and an allowance of the claim made to the succession by the house of Suffolk.[2] Cecil, to compromise the difference, had suggested, that Mary on her part should acknowledge the right to the English crown to be vested in Elizabeth

1561. October 1.

1562. Jan. 5.

[1] Randolph feared that "Mary would never come to God, unless "the queen's majestie should draw her."—Keith, 207. Yet he repeatedly asserts, that he himself, the Lord James and Maitland, believed in the sincerity of her professions of friendship for Elizabeth. —Keith, 195, 196, 203, 206, 209.

[2] "How prejudicial that treaty is to such title and interest as by "birth and natural descent of your own lineage may fall to us, by "the very inspection of the treaty itself you may easily perceive, "and how slenderly a matter of so great consequence is wrapped up "in obscure terms. We know how near we are descended of the "blood of England, and what devices have been attempted to make "us as it were a stranger from it. We trust, being so near your "cousin, you would be loth we should receive so manifest an injury, "as utterly to be debarred from that title, which in possibility may "fall to us. We will deal frankly with you, and wish you to deal "friendly with us. We will have, at this present, no judge of the "equity of our demand but yourself."—Haynes, 377. Keith, 213.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562.

and the lawful heirs of her body; and that Elizabeth should declare on the other, that failing her own issue, the succession belonged of right to the queen of Scots.[1] With this arrangement the latter was satisfied; but when Maitland proposed it to Elizabeth, she replied, that the right of succession to her throne should never be made a subject of discussion; it would beget doubts and disputes, and each individual, according to his interest or partiality, would pronounce this or that marriage valid or invalid. Again, how, she asked, could she admit the right of Mary, without awakening in herself a feeling of dislike for her Scottish sister? Was it possible for any woman to love another whose interest it was to see her dead? Then look at the inconstancy of men's affections. More are wont to worship the rising than the setting sun. It was so in the time of her sister the late queen; and it would be so again, if she were ever to declare her successor.[2] On the failure of this, another expedient was devised, a personal interview, which might enable

[1] It has been said that this proposal originated in a traitorous conspiracy between Cecil and Maitland, for the purpose of interrupting the incipient friendship between the two queens.—Compare Keith, 186, with Mr. Chalmers, i. 51. The fact is, the project had been suggested to Elizabeth before Mary's return from France. On the 14th of July, Cecil wrote to Throckmorton—"there hath been a "matter secretly thought of, which I dare communicate to you, "although I mean never to be an author thereof." He then mentions it, and adds, "the queen's majesty knoweth of it, and so I will end." —Hardwicke Papers, i. 174. When Maitland came to England, Cecil communicated it to him, by whom it was approved, and suggested to Elizabeth. She replied, "that the like was never demanded of any "prince, to be declared his heir apparent in his own time." "The ob- "jection," he owned, "would appear reasonable, if the succession had "remained untouched according to law; but, whereas, by a limita- "tion, men had gone about to prevent the providence of God, and "shift one into the place due to another, then could the party "offended seek no less than the reformation thereof."—Ibid. 373. Hence I see no ground for the charge of conspiracy.

[2] Spottiswood, 181. Matthieu, Hist. de François, ii. 231.

the two queens to settle their differences in an amicable manner. It had long ago been suggested, and had of late been advocated by the lord James and Maitland, and by Cecil and Randolph, under the notion that it might lead to the adoption by Mary of the reformed worship; now, they argued, her pride disdained to yield to the menacing zeal of Knox and the ministers; then she could suffer herself, without disgrace, to be persuaded by the queen of England, an equal and a friend. Mary without suspicion accepted the proposal, and looked forward with pleasure to its accomplishment; the time and place were appointed; even a passport was signed for her and her retinue of one thousand horse. Suddenly Elizabeth hesitated, and then put off the interview till the following year, perhaps, as was suspected by some, through jealousy of the superior beauty of the Scottish queen, perhaps through apprehension of the influence which her presence might have on her partisans in England.[1]

CHAP. II. A.D. 1562. — July 3. July 15.

In the autumn Elizabeth was dangerously ill; and it was rumoured that the council had determined, in case of her death, to pass by the Scottish queen, and to proclaim a successor from the house of Suffolk. On

[1] Haynes, 386, 388—393. Keith, 95, 205, 217—221. Cecil urged, among other objections against the interview, the following, which will surprise the reader: that the rains had made the roads impassable; that the queen's houses on the way from London to York were out of repair; and, that provision of wine, fowl, and poultry could not be made in so short a space as from the 20th of June to the end of August.—Keith, App. 158. On the 24th of August Mary ratified a new agreement for a meeting at York on the 20th of July next.—Lettres de Marie Stuart, i. 150. In November Edinburgh was visited with a "newe dysease called the 'newe ac-"'quaintance;' which passed throughe the whole courte, nether "sparinge lorde, ladie, nor damoysell. Yt ys a payne in their heades "that have yt, and a soreness in their stomacks with a greate coughe. "The queene keapte her bedde vi. dayes. Ther was no appearance "of daynger, nor manie that die of the dysease, excepte some olde "folks."—Stevenson, p. 185.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563. her recovery she was persuaded to summon a parliament; and the Commons, probably at the secret suggestion of her ministers, presented to her an address, requesting her to marry, that she might have issue to inherit the crown; and also to limit the succession, that the next heir might be known, if she were to die without children to survive her. At the same time she was reminded of the attempts of foreign powers to set up a competitor against herself, and of the danger to the reformed faith, if a Catholic should succeed. These remarks were evidently pointed against Mary Stuart, who had already sent her secretary Maitland to London to advocate her claim; but that was in the present instance protected, if not by the justice, at least by the caprice of Elizabeth, who resented the interference of the Commons in a concern which she deemed exclusively her own. It was with reluctance that she consented to receive the petition; when they reminded her of an answer, she reprimanded them for their impatience; and at the close of the session she replied, in quaint and unsatisfactory language, "because I will discharge some restless heads, in whose "brains the needless hammers beat with vain judg-"ment, that I should dislike this their petition; I say, "that of the matter, some thereof I like and allow "very well; as to the circumstances, if any be, I mean "upon further advice further to answer."[1]

Jan. 12.
Jan. 28.
Feb. 12.
April 10.

In a few months the jealousy or policy of Elizabeth was called into action by a communication from Mary, stating that she had received a proposal of marriage from the archduke Charles. The events and the result of the war of religion in Scotland had taught the Catholics of that country to look

[1] Keith, 234—237. Nugæ Antiquæ, i. 83. D'Ewes, 81.

towards Philip of Spain as the only prince willing and able to protect them against the intolerance of the Scottish reformers and the hostility of the English cabinet. Of his willingness there could be no doubt, from his well-known attachment to the ancient faith; in point of power, no monarch in Christendom was at that period able to compete with him; and his possession of the Netherlands would furnish him with the opportunity of pouring troops into Scotland, whenever they might be required. Now to secure his protection there was an obvious expedient,—the marriage of his son Don Carlos with their youthful sovereign. This project had long been discussed among them.[1] Mary herself had of late expressed herself favourably disposed towards it; and Maitland—whether with her privity or not is unknown—had during the sitting of parliament in London requested a secret interview with Quadra, the Spanish ambassador, and opened the matter to him, with an enumeration of the beneficial consequences which might be anticipated from it.[2] When Philip received the report of Quadra, he expressed his readiness to enter on an immediate negotiation respecting the terms of the marriage, but in a few weeks he began to hesitate, alleging the character of his son—probably the young prince had already betrayed symptoms of that derangement which led to his untimely end—and a notion that the queen would provide better for herself and the cause which she espoused, by accepting the offer already made to her by his cousin Charles, archduke of Austria.[3] Still the correspondence between Mary and Philip con-

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563.

June 15.

August 6.

[1] Gonzales, Apuntamientos, p. 41.
[2] Ibid. p. 51.
[3] Ibid. p. 52. Por la disposicion de su hijo.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563.

tinued on this subject for almost two years, with the greatest possible secrecy,[1] but without much earnestness on either part; the king growing more and more dissatisfied with the violent and eccentric behaviour of his son, and the queen being convinced that, if the marriage were to be effected, she must bid adieu to all hope of succeeding, as next in the order of inheritance, to the crown of England, in the event of the death of Elizabeth.[2]

But if the Scottish queen kept secret the project of a marriage with Don Carlos, she deemed it proper to inform her English sister that she had received a proposal from the Austrian archduke, formerly the wooer of Elizabeth. The announcement called into action all the ingenuity of Cecil. To prevent the match, he devised two plans, which were instantly carried into effect. By the first, Elizabeth was again brought forward as a rival to Mary; nor did her vanity entertain a doubt that the archduke would still prefer her charms with her crown to those of her Scottish sister. But from whom was the proposal to originate? It did not seem consistent with female delicacy that the queen should be the first to woo; and it could not be expected that Charles, who had already been rejected, should expose himself to a second refusal. Cecil

August 25. wrote to Mundt, one of the pensionaries in Germany;

Oct. 13. Mundt applied to the duke of Wirtemberg; and that

[1] Mary appears to have written no letters on this subject, but to have trusted entirely to the good faith of two or three agents, who passed to the Low Countries ostensibly on matters of business, but in reality to deliver messages from her to the cardinal Granville, or her aunt the duchess of Arschot, or to receive from them, by word of mouth, the answers of Philip. To show that they deserved credit, they took with them letters to the cardinal or the duchess, generally of mere compliment, and never of real business.—See several of these in the Lettres de Marie, i. 197, 200, 204, 206, et seq.

[2] Ibid. p. 248.

prince, as of himself, solicited the emperor to make a second offer of his son to the English queen. But Ferdinand replied, that he had once been duped by the selfish and insincere policy of Elizabeth, and that he would not expose himself to similar treatment a second time.[1] A.D. 1563. Oct. 13. Oct. 17. December.

The other plan was to induce Mary, by threats and promises, to refuse the archduke. For this purpose Randolph returned to Scotland, with instructions to read to her a long lecture on the choice of a husband. Elizabeth, he told her, preferred a single life; but was not displeased that her younger sister should entertain thoughts of marriage. But she should bear in mind, that her destined husband ought to have three recommendations: he should be one whom she could love; one whom her subjects could approve; and one who was likely to preserve and augment the friendship existing between the two crowns. But was Charles of Austria such a person? The very fact that he had been proposed by the cardinal of Lorrain showed that he was thought the enemy of England. Let Mary recollect that the success of her claim to the succession depended on the choice of her husband. If she forfeited it, she must blame only herself.[2] Aug. 20.

[1] Haynes, 405, 407, 408.

[2] Keith, 242. I may here mention that Chastellet, a French gentleman in the suite of the marshal Damville when he accompanied Mary from France to Scotland, returned to Edinburgh in November, 1562, and presented to her a letter from the marshal, with a book of poetry of his own composition. By Mary, who wrote poetry herself, the book was graciously received; she gave him a horse in return; and occasionally conversed with him, probably on their common studies. About the end of January this man was discovered one evening under the queen's bed, armed with a sword and a dagger. She was not acquainted with the fact till the next morning, when she forbade him ever more to appear in her presence. But he followed

CHAP. II. A.D. 1563.

This ambiguous menace induced the Scottish queen to ask who it was that her English sister would recommend, and in what manner she was willing to favour her claim. The questions were forwarded to Cecil, and drew from him a new set of instructions to Randolph; to describe in the first place to Mary the qualities which her future husband ought *not* to possess; then to direct her attention to some British nobleman without naming any individual; and lastly, to inform her that the proceedings with respect to her claim would depend on the satisfaction which she might give by her marriage. But the queen would not appear to understand the hint; her English sister had plainly some one in view for her. Who was he? Randolph hesitated; but revealed the important secret to the lord James, lately created earl of Murray, and to secretary Maitland, that the husband destined for their sovereign was the lord Robert Dudley, the minion of Elizabeth. By degrees it was suffered to transpire, and then was officially communicated to Mary. She replied, as had already been concerted between her and the queen-mother of France, that she thought it beneath her dignity to marry a subject; and hinted through Murray to the envoy, that she looked on the offer of a person so dear to Eliza-

Nov. 17.

1564. March 30.

the court to Dunfermline and Brunt Island, and late in the evening burst into her bedchamber, where she was undressing with two female attendants. Their cries immediately brought assistance. Chastellet was secured, and pretended that he had come to apologize for his former misconduct. The man was evidently mad; and the queen, when her fright had subsided, was inclined to pardon him; but the council hurried him away to St. Andrew's, where his head was struck off in the market-place. Though Chastellet's conduct could not inculpate Mary, yet the tongue of slander was not silent on this occasion.—See Keith, 231; Stevenson, Illustrations, 102: Raumer, iii. 20; Tytler, vi. 319.

1563. Feb. 13.

Feb. 22.

beth as "a proof of good will rather than of good "meaning."[1]

This offer soon became the subject of public conversation. By Dudley himself it was attributed to the policy of Cecil, who, jealous of his superior influence, wished to remove him from the English court. But the general impression was, that Elizabeth looked for a refusal. He was too necessary for her comfort or her pleasures, to allow her to resign him to another woman.[2] It was even suspected that she intended to marry him herself. If he were judged fit to be the husband of one queen, he was equally fit to be the husband of the other.[3]

Mary, by the advice of her council, had condescended in part to the pleasure of her English sister. She had refused every foreign suitor,—the infant of Spain, the archduke of Austria, the prince of Condé, and the dukes of Ferrara, Anjou, Orleans, and Nemours. But was she then to marry the lord Dudley? To him she felt the strongest repugnance; and was strengthened in her aversion by the suggestions of Murray, who is represented as aspiring to the succession himself, and

[1] Keith, 245—252. Some had already selected the duke of Norfolk.—Keith, 261.

[2] Melville, 51. "Mary asked me, whether I thought that the "queen meant truly towards her, inwardly in her heart as she ap- "peared to do outwardly in her speech. I answered freely, that in "my judgment there was neither plain dealing nor upright mean- "ing. This appeared to me, by her offering unto her, with great "appearing earnestness, my lord of Leicester, whom I knew, at that "time, *she could not want.*"—Ibid. 53. "How unwilling the queen's "majesty herself would be to part from him, and how hardly his "mind could be divorced or drawn from that worthy room where "it is placed, let any man see."—Randolph to Cecil, in Keith, 251, and Tytler, vi. 337. Ce n'estoit que pour m'abuser, et retarder les aultres, ce que Lecestre luy mesmes me mandoit par soubs mayn par le moyen de Randel.—Letters, i. 297.

[3] Randolph's letter in Keith, 260.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1564.

therefore interested in keeping his sister unmarried.[1] In a short time the lord Darnley was set up as a rival to Dudley. During the debate on the succession in the English parliament, all parties had agreed that the next heir was to be sought among the descendants either of Margaret the elder, or of Mary the younger, sister of Henry VIII. The Scottish queen was undoubtedly the rightful representative of Margaret; but there were some who contended for her exclusion in favour of the countess of Lennox, the daughter of that princess by her second husband, the earl of Angus. Darnley was the eldest son of the countess; and it was represented to Mary that a marriage with him could not be degrading, since he was sprung by the father from the kings of Scotland, by the mother from those of England; that it would satisfy the demands of Elizabeth, since he had been born in her dominions, and was heir to the lands which his father held of the English crown; and that it would strengthen her claim to the succession, since all the rights of the descendants of Margaret, in both lines, would centre in her and her husband.[2] The idea had been first

April 14. suggested by the countess of Lennox.[3] Mary appeared to listen to it with a willing ear; and the intelligence was immediately conveyed to Elizabeth.[4]

If the conduct of the English queen had been enigmatical before, it became from this period still more

July 5. inexplicable. At her request the earl of Lennox, who

[1] Murray had attempted to obtain an entail of the crown on himself and others of the name of Stuart.—Goodall, i. 199; ii. 358. Chalmers, ii. 435. Camden, i. 132.

[2] See note (H).

[3] Lettres, i. 298.

[4] "I understand she will cast anchor between Dover and Barwick, "though not perchance in that parte we wish for."—Randolph apud Keith, 252.

had now been in exile twenty years, had solicited and obtained permission of the Scottish queen to revisit his native country. Unexpectedly Elizabeth desired Mary not to admit him into her dominions, then gave him both a license to proceed to Scotland, and a letter of recommendation to the queen, and afterwards complained of the gracious reception which he had experienced in consequence of her own request. In like manner, she urged again the projected marriage with Dudley, and created him earl of Leicester, that he might appear more worthy of a royal consort.[1] Mary frankly owned to the ambassador that she suspected the sincerity of the offer. Elizabeth, she understood, had fixed on Leicester for her own husband; but thought it more dignified to wait till some other princess had previously made to him the offer of her hand. She professed, however, a willingness to be guided, in a matter of so much consequence, by the wisdom of her advisers; and a negotiation was opened between Murray and Maitland on the one part, and the earl of Bedford and Randolph on the other. The former demanded that Mary's rights to the succession should be acknowledged, and inquired what additional honours would be conferred on Leicester to render him a fit consort for a queen of Scotland; the latter refused to bind their sovereign by any engagement, or to disclose her intentions with respect to Leicester, till Mary had absolutely accepted the proposal.[2] Thus

CHAP. II. A.D. 1564.

Sept. 1.

Oct. 20.

Nov. 18.

[1] Melville (p. 47) thus describes the creation of the earl of Leicester. "This was done at Westminster with great solemnity, "the queen herself helping to put on his ceremonial, he sitting on "his knees before her with a great gravity. But she could not "refrain from putting her hand in his neck, smilingly tickling him, "the French ambassador and I standing by."

[2] In December Murray and Maitland wrote to inquire of Cecil whether Elizabeth really wished their sovereign to marry Leicester,

CHAP. II A.D. 1565. — Feb. 16.

the matter hung in suspense, till Elizabeth, to the surprise of most men, though she had previously refused, allowed Darnley, the reputed rival of Leicester, to proceed to the Scottish court with letters of recommendation both from herself, and from that nobleman.[1]

The charms of Mary were sufficient, without the attractions of royalty, to captivate the young Darnley; but he had come prepared to woo, and, after a decent interval, he made to the queen a proposal of marriage. She checked his presumption, and refused the ring which he offered;[2] but his pretensions were soon aided

March 5.

by the importunity of Elizabeth, who again required the consent of Mary to a marriage with Leicester, promising in return to take her claim to the succession into consideration, as soon as she herself had made up her own mind whether to remain single or not. At

March 17.

the receipt of this message the Scottish queen burst into tears. It was, she said, treating her as if she were a child; an attempt to bind her irrevocably for the sake of an illusory promise in return. But she soon acted with more spirit. She no longer concealed her partiality for Darnley; her counsellors approved

and in the beginning of February, Randolph required of Mary a positive answer whether she would take him or not: she replied, "Such a one as the queen your mistress, my good sister, does so "well like to be her husband, if he were not her subject, ought not "to mislike me to be mine. Marry! What I shall do lieth in "your mistress's will, who shall wholly guide me and rule me."—Keith, 269. Tytler, vi. 367.

[1] Randolph, November 7, 12, 23. Keith, 253, 255, 259. Cecil had at last persuaded himself that Elizabeth seriously wished Leicester to marry Mary, that she herself might marry a foreign prince.—Ellis, 2 ser. ii. 294. The earl, however, preferred the chance of marrying his own sovereign. Ipse spe potiundæ Elizabethæ plenus, clandestinis literis Bedfordium submonuit, ne rem urgeret, et in spem istam Darlio occulte favisse creditur.—Camden, 113.

[2] Melville, 56.

the choice of their sovereign; Murray, who felt that the reins of government were slipping from his grasp, withdrew from the court; and Maitland, who professed himself a warm advocate of the match, informed Elizabeth that her Scottish sister had come to the determination of making Darnley the partner of her bed and her throne.[1] CHAP. II. A.D. 1565. April 7. April 18.

This announcement surprised and irritated the English queen; for the former despatches of Randolph had led her to expect a different result. Consultation followed consultation; the countess of Lennox was confined to her chamber, and five weeks afterwards transferred to the Tower; her husband and son received orders to return to England under the penalty of forfeiture; a letter subscribed by thirteen counsellors was forwarded to Mary, describing the inconveniences and impolicy of her intended marriage; and the wily Throckmorton was despatched with new instructions as ambassador extraordinary to Scotland. To be prepared for his arrival, Mary solicited the approbation of the Scottish nobility: Murray refused; but thirteen subscribed the instrument, and Darnley was created by the queen earl of Ross. She then admitted Throckmorton; but it was in vain that he argued, promised, or threatened. "I might," said Mary, "have married into the royal houses of Austria, "France, or Spain; but I passed them by to please "your mistress, and selected for my husband one who "is not only her subject, but even her kinsman. Why "is she offended? However, it is now too late to April 23. May 1. May 7. May 8. May 15.

[1] See Cecil's extracts from Randolph's letters in Keith, 158, and Stevenson, 134. A fuller "report" of the letter of March 20 has been published by Von Raumer, iii. 42; but, to prevent misconception, the letter itself should be consulted, which will be found in Keith, 270—274, and Wright, i. 189.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1565. "retract, for I have pledged my word. Yet this will "I do: I will defer the ceremony for three months: "before the expiration of which, my sister's repug- "nance will, I trust, be removed." The ambassador May 19. was then dismissed with the present of a gold chain, and informed Elizabeth that nothing short of "vio- "lence" could break the intended marriage.[1] His June 3. departure was followed by the arrival of a more welcome messenger, Castelnau, the bearer of the approbation and consent of the king of France and the queen-mother.[2]

By the "violence" of which he spoke, Throckmorton alluded to the designs of Murray and his friends. When that nobleman withdrew from the court, he pretended that he could not in conscience remain where idolatry was openly tolerated; his real object, if we may judge from his conduct, was, that he might with greater facility organize a formidable opposition to the marriage. Nor was it without reason that he looked for success. He was sure of the powerful aid of Cecil in the English cabinet; of the services of Randolph, the resident, who thought himself the confidant, whilst he appears to have been the dupe, of the Scotsman;[3] of the co-operation of Hamilton, Argyle, and all those who deemed themselves aggrieved by the restoration of Lennox to his patrimony,

[1] See the several documents in Stevenson, 115—117, 134—140; and Keith, 274, 276.

[2] "Il ne faut pas demander," says Castelnau, "si je fus bien "reçeu de ces deux amans, puis que j'avois de quoi contenter leurs "affections."—Castelnau, 295.

[3] The letters of this envoy disclose the secret connection of Murray with the English cabinet, even while he was prime minister. One instance out of many may suffice. Randolph advises Cecil not to open any more letters directed to Mary in their passage through England, but to send all suspected letters to Murray, "of whose ser- "vice the queen of England is sure." 19 June, 1563.—Keith, 241.

and who feared the aggrandizement of a rival and hostile family; and also—without which the rest could be of little avail—of the assistance to be derived from that spirit of fanatical intolerance which animated the whole body of the kirkmen. To bring this spirit into action, "the evangel" was declared in danger; the Protestants were summoned for the defence of their religion to a convention in Edinburgh; slanderous tales of the intimacy between Mary and Darnley were circulated; he, with respect to his morals, and character, and religious opinions, was held out to public execration; of her it was said that she was bewitched, that the names of the parties were known, and the tokens, rings, and bracelets, inscribed with mysterious characters, discovered; and all true Scotsmen were called upon to rescue the sovereign from shame, the crown from dishonour, and the nation from ruin. So great was the excitement produced, that the English resident ventured to predict the assassination of the new earl of Ross, and to assure his sovereign, that, if she sought to annex Scotland to her own dominions, the present moment offered the most tempting prospect of success.[1]

June 3.

Mary had summoned the Scottish nobles to meet her at Perth; Murray and his friends refused to obey; he, under the pretence of danger to his life from the malice of the earl of Ross; they, that they might

June 22.

[1] Keith, 282. Raumer, 52. Tytler, vi. 402. Randolph was now satisfied that "his credit at the Scottish court was utterly de- "cayed;" and throws out hints of dishonourable tales, which, however, he will not particularize, "that he may not write an unverity." —It is laughable to observe the change in the style of his letters. Whilst Murray governed for his sister, Randolph was the willing herald of Mary's praise; but, from the moment that Murray turned against her, Randolph's letters are filled with dark insinuations or open charges to her prejudice.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1565.

attend the general assembly of the kirk at Edinburgh. To the more influential members of that assembly Randolph communicated a paper signed by Elizabeth, in which she exhorted them to provide for the safety of their religion and the continuance of the amity between the two kingdoms, and promised them her powerful support as long as they should confine their efforts to the prosecution of those objects. Animated by this assurance, the kirk presented to Mary, under the modest name of a supplication, an admonition that the practice of idolatry could not be tolerated in the sovereign any more than in the subject.[1] The reader may judge of her feelings at the receipt of this insulting address; but they soon gave way to an alarm of a still more serious nature. She received secret advice that it was the intention of the discontented lords to make her their prisoner with Lennox and his son, on the afternoon of the following day, when she would be on her road to Callendar to assist at the baptism of a child of Lord Livingstone; and it was remarked, as a confirmation of the intelligence, that they occupied positions the most convenient for such an enterprise, the duke being at Kinneil, Murray at Lochlevin, Argyle at Castle Campbell, and Rothes at the Parretwall. Her resolution was soon taken. Mounting on horseback at five on the Sunday morning, and being escorted by Athole, Ruthven, and the lords of the court, she threaded her way through Kinross to Callendar with such rapidity, that she was out of danger long before her arrival had been expected.[2]

June 25.

June 30.

July 1.

[1] Randolph, July 2. Keith, 285, and 541, 545.

[2] Randolph, July 4. Keith, 291. That this was a real conspiracy was not only maintained at the time, but also in 1568 by thirty-five

Two hours later, Argyle and Boyd met Murray at Lochlevin. But the opportunity was lost; and after some deliberation they authorized Randolph to inform his mistress that the Scottish queen had been alarmed without just cause; that they now saw the necessity of levying an armed force for the preservation of religion, and of the connection with England; that the expense compelled them to ask from her an aid of three thousand pounds, and that they would make it their object to seize the persons of Lennox and his son, and to deliver them to her officers.[1] Mary on the other hand proceeded to Edinburgh, where, to free herself from the state of uncertainty in which she had so long lived, she was a few days later privately married to the young Stuart. This decisive step brought with it one inconvenience. The men who watched her conduct soon espied the increased intimacy between the parties; their reports confirmed the tales previously circulated; and the zealots affected to look with horror on the supposed harlotry of their sovereign.[2]

July 4.

July 9.

noblemen, including Argyle, one of the persons accused.—Goodall, ii. 358. Mary also writes to the French ambassador that she can prove it by the evidence of one hundred gentlemen of the party, to whom she granted a pardon.—Lettres, i. 304. On July 7th, it was even rumoured in London that it had succeeded. In Cecil's diary appears this entry. "July 7. A rumour spread that the queen of "Scots should be taken by the lords Argyle and Murray."—Murdin, 759.

[1] That they communicated their resolutions by a special messenger to Randolph, is clear from their letter to him in Stevenson, 118. What these resolutions were may be inferred from his letter of the 4th.—Keith, 291.

[2] Cecil tells us that the marriage was on the 9th, and that "they "went from Hollyroode howse to the lord Seton's house to bedd." —Keith, 161. Stevenson, 141. Randolph, who knew not then of the marriage, remarks: "The whole day was solemnized, as I do "believe, to some divine God, for suche quietness was in courte that "fewe coulde be seen, and fewe sufferde to enter." At eight in the

CHAP. II. A.D. 1565.

Both parties now began to prepare for the approaching struggle. The lords met at Stirling, and subscribed a bond to stand by each other; a messenger was despatched the next day to Elizabeth, to remind her of her promise, and to solicit speedy and effectual aid; and their emissaries were instructed to inform the people that the profession of the gospel, and the life of Murray, the great support of that profession, were in danger from the machinations of the court. In opposition to these reports, Lennox declared that neither he nor his son had ever sought the death of Murray; both tendered to him the hand of friendship; and Lennox offered to fight the liar who should venture to repeat the charge. Mary on her part ordered Murray on his allegiance to bring forth his proofs; and, that he might do it without fear, sent to him a safe-conduct for himself and eighty others, both coming and returning.[1] At the same time she denied, by proclamation, that the thought of "impeding or molesting others in "using of their religion or consciences freely" had ever
July 16. entered her mind; and called on her faithful subjects to come to the assistance of their sovereign. This sum-

evening the queen set out with no other female attendant 'out the lady Erskine, "whereupon rose manie fowle tales." On their return, two days afterwards, "she and my lord Darlye walked up and "downe the towne dysguysed, untyll supper tyme. These vagaries "make men's tongues chatter."—Stevenson, 119, 120. He first heard of the marriage on the 16th. See note (I).

[1] See the original documents in Keith, App. 108, 109; and Randolph on the 19th July, in Keith, 302. "Whether yt be trewe "or not that the lord Gray should have done yt (the murder), I "knowe not: but by him I here saye yt is come forth."—Ibid. It was plainly a pretext.

[2] Keith, 299. She adds, "As alswa, gif it sal happin ws to have "to do owthir with *oure auld inymeis* or utherwys, we luk to be "certifit be you presentlie in writte quhat we may lippin for at youre "hands."—Ibid. By "auld inymeis" Mary undoubtedly meant the English borderers, to whom Murray had lately made application for assistance. Randolph was careful to represent these words as a re-

mons was cheerfully obeyed; and the number of those who offered their services encouraged her to throw off her former reserve, and acknowledge her choice of Darnley. She ordered the banns to be published, created him duke of Albany, and was married openly to him in the chapel of Holyrood House, by the bishop of Brechin. Proclamation was made that he should be styled king during the time of their marriage, and that all writs should run in the joint names of Henry and Mary, king and queen of Scotland. He was in his twentieth, she had reached her twenty-third year.[1]

July 29.

It was now time that Elizabeth should redeem her pledge. She had ordered a sum of money to be forwarded to Murray; had reinforced the garrison of Berwick with two thousand men; and had named the earls of Shrewsbury and Bedford her lieutenants in the northern counties. But it was plain that, if she wished to extricate her Scottish friends from the danger into which her promises had led them, it would be necessary to make more powerful efforts. She shrunk, however, from the infamy of being the aggressor in a war which the rest of Europe would not fail to attribute to female pique, and unjustifiable resentment; and in place of an armed force she sent Tamworth to Scotland, furnished with commands, recriminations, and threats. But the Scottish queen assumed a spirited and decisive tone. She compelled the messenger to deliver his charge in writing, and

July 31.

flection on Elizabeth, whose subjects they were. "In the wch. your "honour maye note in what credit the Q. matie. our mestres is yet "in, that she cane be contente to use thys terme (our olde enemies)." He did not, however, charge Mary with calling Elizabeth herself an old enemy, as by some mistake he is made to do in Von Raumer, iii. 58.—See the original letter in Cott. MSS. Cal. B. x. fol. 318, b. It was published by Keith, 300—303. There is another without the obnoxious passage, published in the Lettres de Marie Stuart i. 275.

[1] Keith, 306, 307. Lettres de Marie, i. 377.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1565.

answered every article in the same manner, requesting her English sister to be content with the government of her own dominions, and to respect in other sovereigns that independence which she claimed for herself. When Tamworth took leave, he refused the passport which was offered, because it had been signed by Henry as well as Mary; but, to punish the refusal, she ordered the lord Home to apprehend him on his road as a vagrant, and to dismiss him after a confinement of two days. Randolph complained; but she answered, that, unless he ceased to intrigue with her discontented subjects, he would also meet with similar treatment.[1]

August 8. August 19. August 21. August 27.

The associated lords now saw that they were left to their own resources. Unable to withstand the superior force of the royalists, they retired, some towards Ayr, some towards Argyleshire; but the latter, when Henry and Mary left Glasgow, doubling on their pursuers, reached by a rapid march the city of Edinburgh. This momentary success, however, disclosed to them the hopelessness of their cause. None of their former friends dared to join them; and in two days the fire from the castle and the approach of the royal army compelled them, in number one thousand five hundred horsemen, to quit the capital and flee to Dumfries. A month intervened, which was chiefly spent in messages between the parties, and adverse and irritating proclamations. A band of ruffians was organized, under an engagement "to kill Darnley or die themselves:"[2] but

August 29. August 31. Sept. 2.

[1] Keith, 310, App. 99, 162—164. Stevenson, 131. He did meet with similar treatment. In the following February it was proved in the presence of Mary and her council, that in August he had sent four thousand crowns to lady Murray at St. Andrew's for the use of her lord. He replied, that he should answer for his conduct to no one but his own mistress. Mary sent him to England, and acquainted Elizabeth with the reason.—Lettres de Marie, i. 325.

[2] Keith, App. 164. Stevenson, 144. Murdin, 759. There was

no sooner were the royalists in march against Dumfries than the rebel force disbanded, and their chiefs accepted the asylum which the earl of Bedford had prepared for them in Carlisle. Murray was allowed to proceed to London. At first Elizabeth refused to see him; afterwards he was admitted in presence of the French and Spanish ambassadors, when, falling on his knees, he acknowledged that the queen was innocent of the conspiracy, and had never advised them to disobey their sovereign lady. "Now," she replied, "have ye spoken truth. Get from my presence, traitors as ye are." By this meanness he obtained from her a small pittance for his support at Berwick, though she obliged him to represent it as furnished by the charity of his English friends.[1]

Oct. 8.

certainly enough in the public conduct of Murray at this period to account for Mary's hostility to him; but Randolph, on August 27, hinted to Cecil that he suspected another and more secret cause; and now that his friend was seeking an asylum in England, he described that cause in the following enigmatical manner: "She "knoweth that he understandeth some such secret part (not to be "named for reverence sake) that standeth not with her honour: "which he so much detesteth, being her brother, that neither can he "show himself as he hath done, nor she think of him as of one whom "she mortally hateth. Here is the mischief; this is the grief; and "how this may be salved and repaired, it passeth, I trow, man's wit, "to consider. This reverence for all that he hath to his sovereign "that I am sure there are very few that know this grief (*sic*): and "to have this obloquy and reproach of her removed that is now "commen (*come*), I believe he would quit his country for all the "days of his life." I shall not notice the odious interpretation which Mr. Von Raumer has put on this passage (p. 69), because it is not supported by a single atom of evidence. There can be little doubt that Randolph alluded to the report of Mary's too great intimacy with Riccio, which report had been lately spread by the partisans of Murray. But whatever it was, Randolph himself soon discovered that "the grief which could not be salved and repaired" no longer existed, and that the objection to the pardon of Murray came, not as he had supposed, from the queen, but from her husband. —Keith, App. 165. Stevenson, 151.

[1] Melville, 57. Notwithstanding the farce enacted before the two ambassadors, there are several letters extant which prove, beyond

CHAP. II. A.D. 1565.

But while the queen thus opposed every obstacle in her power to the marriage of Mary Stuart, she had been actively employed in seeking a husband for herself. From whatever cause her former repugnance had sprung, it was at length subdued by the clamour of the nation, the remonstrances of her counsellors, and her apprehension of additional danger from the claim of the Scottish queen, if that princess should have issue, while she herself remained childless. But she found it more easy to determine to marry, than to fix on the choice of a husband. Had she consulted her affection only, she would undoubtedly have given her hand to Leicester; but she had to contend with the disapprobation of her most trusty advisers, who appealed, and ultimately with success, to her pride, her suspicions, and her parsimony. Cecil, indeed, was too wily a courtier to commit himself by an avowed opposition; that office had been assumed by the earl of Sussex, who could rely on the co-operation of the duke of Norfolk and the whole house of Howard, of the lord Hunsden, the queen's cousin, and of Sir Thomas Heneage, vice-chamberlain, and a rising favourite. By their persuasions Elizabeth was brought to think seriously of a foreign husband; and occasionally, at least, to dispute the ascendancy which Leicester assumed over her. After the marriage of Mary, she gave him hints of her displeasure in enigmatic notes; he even thought proper to absent himself from court,

contradiction, that Elizabeth was an accomplice in this conspiracy. I will cite only one from Murray to Cecil, of October 14. "As for "me and the remainder here, I doubt not but you understand sufficiently, that neither they nor I enterprised this action without "forfeit of our sovereign's indignation, but being moved thereto by "the queen your sovereign and council's handwriting, directed to "us thereupon; which being followed, all those extremities followed, "as were sufficiently foreseen."—Apud Chalmers, ii. 330.

whether it were in a fit of jealousy or at the royal command.[1] But their quarrels ended, as the quarrels of lovers generally end; and by each reconciliation his influence over her heart was confirmed. Publicly, he affected to advocate the project of a foreign alliance; but privately he threw every obstacle in its way; and if he did not ultimately obtain the queen for himself, he succeeded at least in extinguishing the hope of every other suitor, whether native or foreigner.

Of foreigners, the only prince towards whom she looked with pleasure was her former suitor, the archduke Charles. The objections of the emperor had been subdued by the perseverance of the duke of Wirtemberg; but the death of that prince interrupted the negotiation;[2] and Elizabeth, attributing the indifference which he had manifested to the report of her familiarity with Leicester, had ordered Cecil to write a letter to Mundt, in which, after a high en-

1564. Sept. 8

[1] Compare Murdin, 760, with Strype, 475, and Camden, 118. Cecil in Wright, i. 209. "Her favour to my lord of Leicester is not "so manifest as it was, to move men to thynk that she will marry "with him." While Leicester was absent, it was reported that some other favourite supplied his place. "Upon these rumours," says Cecil, "I affirm, that the queen may be by malicious tongues "not well reported; but, in truth, she herself is blameless, and hath "no spot of evil intent. Marry, there may lack, especially in so "busy a world, circumspection to avoid all occasions."—Strype, 481. She had at this time also a foreign female favourite. "The "marquis of Baden, being gone home into Germany, hath left here "behinde him in the court the lady Cecilia his wife, with whose "conversation the queene is so much delighted as she doth not only "allow her honourable bouche at court, three messes of meate a day "for each of her maides and the rest of her familie, but alsoe her "matie. hath dealt so liberally with her husband, that he hath a "yearlie pension of two thousand crownes, which he is to enjoy as "long as he suffereth his ladie to recide here in England."—Allen to the earl of Shrewsbury, 11 December, 1565.

[2] "The quene hath been at great chardges with *the exequies* for "the emperor, which began on Monday, and ended yesterday."—Cecil to Smith, October 4.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1564.

comium on the character of the favourite, he was made to express his belief, that the queen loved him on account of his admirable qualifications, as a sister loves a brother, and that in their private meetings nothing was admitted inconsistent with female modesty and decorum.[1] Armed with a copy of this letter, the duke renewed his solicitations; but Maximilian, who had succeeded his father, displayed no eagerness for the marriage, and two years were suffered to elapse between the first overture from Cecil and the arrival

1565. May.

of Swetkowytz, the imperial ambassador. He came ostensibly to restore the insignia of the Garter worn by Ferdinand; in effect to discover the real disposition of the queen towards the archduke Charles. Her indecision immediately revived; one day she listened to Leicester, the next to Sussex; and these two noblemen, apprehending the resentment of each other, went constantly armed, and followed by armed men.[2] At last the ambassador was told that the articles of

June 4.

the marriage between Philip and Mary must be taken

August 6.

as the basis of any future treaty; but that, as Elizabeth had made a vow never to choose a husband whom she had not previously seen, it was indispensably requisite that Charles should pay a visit to the English court.[3] To this, as long as the result was doubtful, the pride of the emperor refused to submit, and the negotiation was suspended for a considerable period.

[1] The history of this extraordinary letter seems to prove that Cecil was not convinced of the truth of the assertions which he was compelled to make. He would not allow it to remain in the possession of Mundt, but, after he had submitted it to the inspection of the queen, added a postscript, in which he required Mundt to send it back to him. This was done, and when he received it back, he added to it a note, showing that he had written it by the express command of Elizabeth.—Haynes, 420.

[2] Camden, 118. Murdin, 760. [3] Haynes, 421—437.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1565.

The ambition of Leicester had never suffered him to despond; the turn which the proceedings had now taken gave a new impulse to his hopes and exertions. Conceiving that the recommendation of a royal personage might weaken the objection drawn from his inferiority of birth, he solicited the aid of the queen regent of France; and Catherine, who had no wish to see an Austrian prince seated on the English throne, willingly accepted the office. She began by offering to her dear sister the hand of her son, the reigning monarch. Elizabeth, in a few days, replied, that Charles was both too great and too little; too great, for he would never quit his kingdom of France to live with her in England; too little, for he was only fourteen, she thirty years of age.[1] Moreover, she had reason to fear that her subjects would never suffer a French prince upon the English throne. This answer had been anticipated; and the ambassador was instructed to observe, that, after the rejection of Charles, the queen would never offer him the affront of selecting any other foreign prince; that there could be no difficulty in her marriage with one of her own subjects; and that the earl of Leicester was a nobleman whose great qualities rendered him worthy of her choice. She replied, that to marry at all would be like tearing her heart out of her body, and that, if she ever submitted to it, it would only be through a wish to consult the interests of her people.[2]

This answer did not discourage Leicester. Having waited on the secretary, and extorted from that wary statesman a promise of neutrality, he urged his suit to the queen, conjuring her to make up her mind, and

November.

[1] Castelnau, xliv. 126, 142.
[2] De Foy, apud Raumer, iii. 35.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566. — April.

to relieve him from his anxiety. He asked for her final determination at Christmas; she promised it at Candlemas. Candlemas came, and passed. Elizabeth was still irresolute; and Cecil hinted to her six important objections to the marriage. 1. Leicester would not bring with him riches, or power, or estimation; 2. He was deeply involved in debt; 3. He was surrounded by needy and rapacious dependants, who would engross the offices and favours of the crown; 4. He was so violent and mutable in his passions, one day so jealous, the next so indifferent, that the queen could not expect to live happily with him; 5. His reputation was tarnished by the tragic death of his former wife; and lastly, his marriage with his sovereign would be taken as full confirmation of the scandalous reports of their preceding amours, which had been so long and so confidently circulated. It was plain that some of these reasons had made impression on the mind of Elizabeth; the earl could

August.

not disguise his disappointment; and the queen, to console her lover, assured him that he still stood equally high in her estimation; that she was not yet resolved to marry at all, but that, if she ever did marry a subject, he should be the man.[1]

The advocates for a foreign prince had now obtained the ascendancy; and the earl of Sussex was despatched

1567. June 28.

to the emperor Maximilian to resume the negotiation with the archduke, who took with him a colleague, the lord North, who had been bribed to betray to the favourite all the secrets of the negotiation.[2] Sussex

Oct. 18.

forwarded to Elizabeth the most favourable description of the person, the temper, and the capacity of

[1] De Foy; and Haynes, 444.
[2] Camden, i. 418.

the archduke;[1] and obtained from that prince a promise that he would be content with the private celebration of mass for himself and his Catholic servants; and would assist on occasions of ceremony at the new service in the company of the queen. But in the absence of Sussex, Leicester ruled without control; a council was called, and an answer was returned, that if the archduke really aspired to the hand of Elizabeth, he must abandon without reserve the religion of his fathers.[2] Charles, conceiving himself the dupe of the queen's dissimulation and policy, married Mary, the daughter of Albert, duke of Bavaria.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1567. — Dec. 10.

The history of the English is so interwoven with that of the Scottish queen, that it will again be necessary to revert to the extraordinary events which took place in the neighbouring kingdom. Mary, in the ardour of her affection, had overlooked the defects in the character of her husband. Experience convinced her that he was capricious in his temper, violent in his passions, implacable in his resentments. He had already contracted habits of ebriety, which led him

[1] Lodge, i. 366, 367. "Yf God coppell you together in lyking, you "shall have of him a trewe husband, a lovying companyon, a wise "councelor, and a faythfull servant; and we shall have as virtuouse "a prynce as ever ruled."—Ibid. 372. Sussex, however, did not expect to prevail. Alluding to the secret opposition of Leicester, he says, "When I remember who worke in this vyneyard, I can hardly "hope of a good wyne yere: neverthelesse I wylle do my parte, "whyle I am here, and leave the reste to God."—Ibid. i. 373.

[2] At this proposal the archduke exclaimed: "Howe, counte, "cowld you with reason gyve me councell to be the fyrste of my "race that so soddenly showlde chaunge the relygion that all my "awncestors have so long holden, when I knowe no other; or how "can the quene lyke of me in eny other thyng, that should be so "lyght in chaungyng of my conscyence?—This is my only requeste; "yf her matie. satysfye me in this, I wyll never slack to serve and "satysfye her whyle I lyve, in all the reste."—Ibid. 372

CHAP. II. A.D. 1567.

occasionally into the most scandalous excesses, and made him forget, even in public, the respect due to his consort.[1] But his ambition proved to her a source of more bitter disquietude. She had summoned a parliament for the twofold purpose of attainting the most guilty of the fugitive rebels, and of granting liberty of conscience for those among her subjects who, like herself, professed the ancient faith. But Darnley insisted that, in addition, the duke of Chastelherault and his partisans should be included in the attainder, and that a matrimonial crown should be granted to himself. By the first of these measures the rival house of Hamilton would have forfeited its right to the succession; by the second, the government would be secured to the king during the term of his natural life. But Mary refused; she was deaf to his entreaties, complaints, and menaces; and the discontented prince directed his resentment against those whom he supposed to be her advisers, and particularly against David Riccio, one of her secretaries.

Riccio was a native of Piedmont, who had come to Scotland in the suite of the ambassador of Savoy. At the request of that minister, the queen had appointed him one of the pages of the chamber, and, on the removal of Raulet, had advanced him to the office of secretary for the French language. All her correspondence with foreign princes passed through his

[1] "Some say he is vicious: whereof too many were witnesses the "other day at Inchkeith. I will not rehearse to your honour, what "of certainty is said of him at his being there." At a public entertainment, Mary requested him not to drink to excess. "He gave "her such words that she left the place in tears."—See the letters of Randolph and Drury, in Keith, 329, App. 163, 165, 166. As early as September 1, Cecil writes: "The yong kyng is so insolent, "as his father is weary of his government, and is departed from the "court."—Ellis, 2 Ser. ii. 303. See also a letter, 1 Ser. ii. 200.

hands; his address and fidelity obtained her approbation, and, on her marriage, he was appointed keeper of the privy purse to the king and queen. In this situation he soon earned the enmity of the former, by adhering to his mistress in every domestic quarrel, and, perhaps, by refusing to make advances of money without her authority. But in addition to Darnley, there were also many of the natives who viewed his preferment with displeasure. Riccio was a stranger and a Catholic; two qualities calculated to excite the jealousy both of the courtiers and of the preachers.[1] CHAP. II. A.D. 1567.

Besides the lords who had taken refuge in England, several others remained at court, who had been equally engaged in the conspiracy, but had not betrayed themselves by an overt act of rebellion. At the head of the latter were Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, and Maitland, who, sensible that their fate was linked with that of their associates, anxiously sought an opportunity of preventing the attainder with which they were threatened.[2] In January, Mary, in opposition to her husband, granted a pardon to the duke, on condition that he should reside for some years on the continent; and 1566. Jan. 2.

[1] The industry of Mr. Chalmers (ii. 156) has traced, from the treasurer's accounts, the gradual advancement of Riccio, and has proved that he was never one of the queen's musicians, as is generally believed on the authority of Melville. But Melville's memoirs abound with tales, of which many are doubtful, many most certainly false.

[2] To account for the conduct of Morton, we are often told, on the very fallible authority of Knox, that the queen had taken the seals from the earl, and given them to her favourite Riccio. This fable is easily refuted. As early as the 12th of October, both Morton and Maitland, though resident at court, and members of the council, were secretly leagued with Murray. "They only espie their time," says Randolph, "and make fair weather, till it shall come to the "pinch."—Apud Chalmers, ii. 464. Yet Morton was still chancellor on the 9th of the following April, the day of Riccio's murder. —Keith, App. 117, 128.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

Maitland, relying on the discontent of the king, formed the project of inducing him to make common cause with the exiles. By the agency of George Douglas, an illegitimate son of his uncle, the late earl of Angus, it was suggested to him that Mary had transferred her affections to Riccio;[1] that the pardon of the Hamiltons, and the refusal of the matrimonial crown, had proceeded from the advice of that minion; and that the only expedient for him to obtain his just rights was to call in the aid of the expatriated lords. The inexperienced prince became the dupe of this interested advice, and cast himself into the arms of the men who had hitherto professed themselves his enemies. Two bonds were prepared and subscribed, the one by Darnley, the other by Argyle, Glencairn,

[1] In a letter from Bedford and Randolph (Robertson, i. App. xv.), and in a short narrative supposed to be written by Lord Ruthven, but not published till after his death by Cecil,—it is insinuated that Riccio was the queen's paramour. There can be no doubt that this is a calumny. It is improbable in itself, considering his age and person; it is not mentioned by Knox, whose charity would have rejoiced to advance such a charge against Mary; it is not even hinted by Darnley himself, when he was solicited by the council to make his complaints against her, and "not to spare her."—Keith, 349. See also Tytler, ii. 4. I may add that both the letter and the narrative were got up for the occasion at the request of Cecil, and are therefore less deserving of credit. On the 20th of March he wrote to Randolph to advertise him "at good lengthe, with the "circomstances of those thyngs that were done at the tyme, and of "the speaches betwixt the quene and them." He and Bedford write in return,—"All that hytherto we have hearde, having con-"ferred the reports from abroode which come to our knoulege, "with the sayings of these noble men, the lord Morton and lord "Ruthven, that are present, and of them all, that which we have "founde neareste to the trothe, or as we beleve, the trothe self, "have here put them in wryting." They add that Morton and Ruthven will shortly send an account themselves, conclude with an excuse for the indelicate language which they have attributed to the king and queen, and in a postscript add that Murray recommends them to Cecil as his "dere friends, and such as for *his sake* "hathe geven this adventure."—Ellis, ii. 218.

Murray, Rothes, Boyd, and Ochiltree. Darnley engaged to prevent their attainder, to obtain their pardon, to support their religion, and to aid them in all their just quarrels: they to become his true subjects, friends to his friends, and enemies to his enemies; to obtain for him the crown matrimonial during the whole of his life: for that purpose to take part with him "against all and whosoever that live and die "might;" to obtain his just claim to the succession failing the lady Mary; to extirpate, or slay every gainsayer; and to use their influence with the queen of England, in favour of his mother and brother, "that "they might be delivered out of ward."[1] These engagements were followed by another still more atrocious, in which Darnley avowed his determination to bring to punishment divers persons, especially an Italian called David, who abused the confidence of the queen; and, if there were any difficulty to proceed by way of law, "to take them and slay them whereso-"ever it might happen; and thenceforth bound him-"self and his heirs to save scathless all earls, lords, "barons, and other, who should aid him in that "enterprise."[2] The other persons marked out for slaughter in this instrument were supposed to be the earls of Huntley, Bothwell, and Athol, the lords Flemming and Livingston, and Sir James Balfour.[3]

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566. Feb. 20. March 1.

Reports were again circulated, that "the evangel" was in danger; that Riccio was a secret agent from the pope, and that Mary had signed the holy league, by which, as was pretended, the Catholic princes

[1] Goodall, i. 227—233.

[2] Ibid. 266. In this instrument, "to call" means to proceed by law.

[3] Mary's letter in Keith, 332. Indictment of Yair in Arnot. App. 280.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566. —

bound themselves to exterminate the Protestants by a general massacre.[1] Most of the conspirators in Edinburgh were leading members in the kirk, and had procured from the Assembly the proclamation of

March 3. a general fast, to be kept from Sunday to Sunday, on the week in which the parliament was to open. As if it were intended to prepare the minds of the godly for scenes of blood, and a revolution in the government, the service for each day was composed of lessons from the Old Testament, descriptive of the extirpation of idolatry, the punishment of wicked princes, and the visitations of God on his people, whenever they neglect the admonitions of the pro-

March 7. phets.[2] On the Thursday of the fast, the queen, with the nobility, chose the Lords of the Articles; the statute of attainder was then drawn, and the Tuesday following was fixed for the day on which it

March 9. should be passed. But on the Saturday, Morton and Lindsay, between seven and eight in the evening, with eighty armed men, took possession of the gates of the palace. Mary, who was indisposed and in the seventh month of her pregnancy, was at the time seated at supper in the closet of her bed-chamber, with the

[1] Melville, 57, 63. Randolph suspected that the queen had signed some league for the support of the Catholic worship.—Stevenson, 153, 159. She had undoubtedly received, by Clerneaux, a message from the pontiff, in which he exhorted her to constancy, recommended to her care the interests of the Catholic faith in her realm, and requested her to send some of the Scottish prelates to the Council of Trent.—Jebb, ii. 25. Her answer may be seen in Platt. Con. Trid. iv. 660. She herself hoped at the parliament "to "have done some good anent restoring the auld religion" (Keith, 331); "which is explained by Randolph, that she will have mass "free for all men that will hear it."—Cotton MSS. Col. B. 9, f. 232. This is the only ground on which it has been asserted that the Scottish queen had entered into a league for the extirpation of Protestants.

[2] Goodall, i. 247—250, 273.

commendator of Holyrood House and the countess of Argyle, her bastard brother and sister. Riccio, Erskine, captain of the guard, and Beaton, master of the household, were in attendance.[1] Suddenly the king entered by a private staircase, and placing himself next the queen, put his arm round her waist He was followed by Lord Ruthven, in complete armour, the master of Ruthven, Douglas, Ballentyne, and Kerr. Mary, alarmed at the sight of Ruthven, commanded him to quit the room, under the penalty of treason; but he replied, that his errand was with David; and the unfortunate secretary, exclaiming "Justitia, justitia!" sprung for protection behind his sovereign. Her prayers and gestures were despised. Ballentyne threatened her with his dagger; Kerr presented his pistol to her breast; and Douglas, snatching the king's dirk, struck over her shoulder, and left the weapon sticking in the back of Riccio. The table was thrown over in the struggle; and the assassins, dragging their victim through the bedchamber, despatched him in the adjoining room, with no fewer than fifty-six wounds. CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

Mary's friends, ignorant of the affray in the closet, had hurried from their apartments to oppose Morton and his band of armed followers. After some fighting, they were driven back; Huntley and Bothwell made their escape through the windows; the rest maintained themselves in different rooms, till they were allowed to depart, about two in the morning. At noon, Darnley, of his own authority, dissolved the parliament; and before evening, he was joined by March 10.

[1] Cecil's Ruthven makes Riccio to be seated at one end of the table.—Keith, App. 123. Mary, in her letter, numbers him among her domestic servants in the room.—Keith, 331.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566. March 11. Murray and the exiles from Berwick. The following morning, the chiefs of the conspirators sat in secret consultation; and it was resolved to confine the queen in the castle of Stirling, till she should consent to approve in parliament of the late proceedings, to establish "the evangel" by law, and to give to her husband the crown matrimonial. After dinner, relying on the assurances of Darnley, they separated, and repaired to their respective dwellings in the city.[1]

Mary had passed the first night and day in fits and lamentations. She felt some relief from the kind expressions of her brother, the earl of Murray; and was so sooner left alone with her husband, than she resumed her former ascendancy, and convinced him of the impropriety of his conduct. Darnley's repentance rendered unnecessary the preparations which had been March 12. made by Huntley and Bothwell; and the same night, the king and queen, attended by the captain of the guard and two servants, secretly left the palace, and reached in safety the castle of Dunbar.[2] The royal standard was immediately unfurled; before the end of the week eight thousand faithful subjects had hastened to the aid of Mary; and as she approached

[1] Keith, 330; App. 119. Robertson, i. App. xv. Arnot, 378, 380. "After this manner," says Knox, "the noblemen were relieved of their trouble, and restored to their places and rooms; "and likewise the church reformed; and all that professed the "evangel within this realm, after fasting and prayer, were delivered "and freed from the apparent dangers which were like to have "fallen upon them."—Knox, Hist. 394. There can hardly be a doubt that both Knox, and a brother minister, Craig, were of counsel in the perpetration of the murder.—See Mr. Tytler's Scotland, vii. 354—362.

[2] On the same day the earl of Bedford at Berwick, unaware of the turn which took place that evening, wrote to Cecil, exulting "that everything now would go well."—Apud Chalmers, i. 167.

Edinburgh, the murderers left the city, and fled with precipitation to Berwick. The English queen had been informed of the object of the conspiracy; she had even ordered three hundred pounds to be given to Murray before he left Berwick; but when she heard of the result, she sent her congratulations to her Scottish sister, and at her request commanded the assassins to leave the kingdom. But the messenger was instructed to remark, at the same time, that England was long and broad; and that they had nothing to fear, if they did not provoke inquiry by obtruding themselves on the notice of the public.[1]

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566. March 18. May 7.

Mary, with her characteristic facility, affected to believe the apology and protestations of her husband,[2] granted a full pardon to Murray and his companions, and, though a few of the minor criminals were punished with death, extended her mercy to several of the conspirators, who were not actually engaged in the murder. As the time of her delivery approached,

[1] Id. ii. 353. Their defence to the earl of Bedford may be seen in Stevenson, 169. They protest that in this murder "they mened "no other thing but the establishinge of the religion, conservacion "of the amytie betwixt the towe realmes, and the relief of their "frends." Charles IX. of France, in a despatch to Fourquevaulx, his ambassador in Spain (8 Ap. 1566), says, that Mary had in several letters to her uncle, the cardinal of Lorrain, given a detailed account of this malheureuse tragedye. . . . "que le marché, que "avoient faict les meschans, qui en sont coupables, n'estoit pas "seulement de tuer le secretaire, mais elle mesme, et l'enfant dont "elle est grosse, avecques promesse de couronner son mari roy de la "couronne matrimonialle, et aprés sa morte hereditaire. La pauvre "dame dict d'avantage qu'elle a este traisnée, oultraigée et em-"prisonnée, et estoit en telle estat qu'elle s'estimoit sans Royaume." —From a copy of the despatch by H. Howard, Esq.

[2] He published a declaration of his innocence of the conspiracy. —Keith, 334. It deceived no one, and lowered him in the estimation of all. Mary herself, though she had seen the bonds, says she did always excuse him thereof, and was willing to appear as if she believed it not.—Ibid. 350.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

she took up her residence in the castle of Edinburgh. Both Elizabeth and Murray, the people of England and the people of Scotland, looked forward with suspense and anxiety to the result. It might give Mary an heir to her throne and her pretensions; it might, considering the distressing scenes through which she had passed, prove fatal both to the mother and the child. Murray excluded from the castle every person of eminence but his brother-in-law Argyle; and Elizabeth ordered Randolph, who for his connection

May 27.

with the conspirators had been expelled from Scotland,[1] to linger in the neighbourhood of Berwick. At length their hopes, if they really cherished such guilty hopes, were disappointed. The Scottish queen

June 19.

was delivered of a son; and the child lived to ascend the thrones of both kingdoms. Elizabeth was dancing at Greenwich when Cecil whispered the intelligence in her ear. She instantly retired to her chair, reclined her head on her hand, and appeared for some time absorbed in profound thought. By the next morning her feelings were sufficiently subdued, and the messenger was admitted. She expressed her satisfaction at the happy event, accepted the office of gossip at

[1] Mary having obtained proofs that he had been active in all the conspiracies against her, ordered him to quit the kingdom; and wrote to excuse the measure to Elizabeth, "as his behaviour must "have been besides (Elizabeth's) opinion, and tending to some "other fine or purpose, nor that for the quhilk he was directed there "by her."—Keith, 344. Her chief complaint was that Randolph supplied her rebels with money; a complaint the truth of which is attested by Randolph himself in Ellis, 2 Ser. iii. 124. At this time Mary's envoy to Elizabeth was Robert Melville; and Randolph, in a confidential letter to Cecil, complains that to him, through the thoughtless loquacity of the queen, the secrets of his despatches had been revealed to his own discredit in Scotland, and to the manifest danger of their Scottish friends.—Haynes, 447.

the baptism, and appointed the earl of Bedford to assist in quality of her ambassador at the ceremony.[1] CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

In England the birth of the young prince, who was named James, was hailed with exultation by the advocates of the Scottish line; many who had appeared indifferent as long as Mary remained childless, came forward in support of her cause; and Elizabeth herself, jealous of the good fortune of her sister queen, began to think seriously of marriage, that she also might have issue to inherit her crown. At the same time she grew more fixed in her resolution to keep the right of succession undecided, perhaps through apprehension of danger, more probably from the selfishness of ambition, which could not bear another so near the throne. Her obstinacy, however, was productive of one advantage to the nation; it put an end to that tame submission to the will of the sovereign which had characterized and disgraced the parliaments under the dynasty of the Tudors. The discontent of the nation burst forth in defiance of every restraint imposed by the government; and the motives and obligations of the queen were discussed with a freedom of speech which alarmed the court, and scandalized the advocates of arbitrary power.

After six prorogations poverty had compelled Elizabeth to summon a parliament. The lords of the council, aware of the national feeling, requested to be informed of her sentiments respecting marriage and Oct. 12.

[1] Melville, 70. The prince was christened after the Catholic rite by the archbishop of St. Andrew's. Bedford, though sent by the queen to attend, did not enter the chapel, but remained without in the company of Murray and several of the saints. The countess of Argyle, who held the child at the font, at the request of the English queen, was compelled to do public penance in the kirk for her participation in an idolatrous ceremony.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

the succession. She heard them with impatience. Her subjects, she said, from their experience of the past, might rely on her maternal solicitude for the future. They had no reason to complain of her government, unless it were on account of the war with France, the blame of which her councillors might take to themselves, since they had dragged her into it against her better judgment. As far as regarded her marriage, they were acquainted with the negotiation into which she had entered; but as to her opinion respecting the succession, she should keep it locked up in her own breast. Let them go and perform their duties, and she would perform hers.[1]

Oct. 18. As soon as the motion for a supply was made in the lower house, it was opposed on the ground that the queen had not redeemed the pledge, on the faith of which the last grant had been voted; she had neither married, nor declared her successor. It was in vain that to subdue the opposition a royal message informed the house that she had resolved to marry. A vote was passed, that the business of the supply and of the succession should accompany each other.[2]

Oct. 22. The upper house sent a deputation of twenty peers to lay before the queen the evils resulting from her silence. She answered in an angry and imperious tone, that she did not choose that her grave should be dug while she was yet alive; that the Commons had acted like rebels; they had behaved to her as they durst not have behaved to her father; that the Lords might come to similar resolutions, if they pleased;

[1] See a letter to the king of France, probably from the French ambassador, published by Mr. D'Israeli, Curiosities of Literature, III, 118.

[2] D'Ewes, 124. D'Israeli, ibid.

their votes were but empty sounds without her assent. She would never confide such high and important interests to a multitude of harebrained politicians, but meant to select six grave and discreet counsellors, and when she had heard their opinions, would acquaint the Lords with her decision.[1] CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

This answer provoked several warm discussions in both houses. Sentiments were uttered, which for centuries had not been heard within those walls; that the tranquillity of the nation was not to be hazarded to lull the apprehensions of a weak and capricious woman; that the queen possessed her high dignity for the public benefit; and that, if she were negligent of her duty, it was the office of the Lords and Commons to compel her to perform it. The earls of Pembroke and Leicester received a prohibition to appear in the royal presence. The duke of Norfolk, who, though he spoke with caution, was suspected of being the leader of the opposition, was marked out for imprisonment and prosecution.[2] Oct. 27.

The two houses now joined in a common petition, which was read to the queen by the lord keeper, in presence of a numerous deputation of lords and commoners. Her reply was delivered with great temper, but wrapped, as usual, in affected obscurity of language. Nov. 5.

[1] Lords' Journals, 635. D'Israeli, 119—121. Mr. D'Israeli thinks that the expression of digging her grave while yet alive alluded to her supposed objection to marriage, ob nescio quam muliebrem impotentiam.—Camden, i. 123. It is, however, plain that both their petition and the answer refer not to the queen's marriage, but to the succession. Her meaning was explained by herself on another occasion. "I will not be buried while I am living, as my "sister was. Do I not know how, during her life, every one has- "tened to me at Hatfield? I am not inclined to see any such "travellers."—D'Israeli, iii. 114.

[2] Camd. 124, 125. Murdin, 762. D'Israeli, 121.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

"If," she said, "any here doubt that I am by vow or "determination bent never to trade in that kind of "life (marriage), put out that kind of heresy, for your "belief is therein awry. For though I can think it "best for a private woman, yet I do strive with "myself, to think it not meet for a prince; and if I "can bend my liking to your need, I will not resist "such a mind. As to the succession, the greatness of "the cause, and the need of your returns, doth make "me say, that which I think the wise may easily "guess, that as a short time for so long continuance, "ought not to pass by rote, as many tell their tales; "even so, as cause by conference with the learned "shall show me matter worth the utterance for your "behoof, so shall I more gladly pursue your good "after my days, than with all my prayers, whilst I Nov. 9. "live, be means to linger my living thread."[1] With this enigmatic answer the Commons were not content. But Elizabeth sent them an order to proceed to other matters. They maintained that the royal message was an infringement of their liberties; she repeated the Nov. 12. command. They obeyed with reluctance; but still allowed the bill for the subsidy, which had been read only once, to lie unnoticed on the table. The queen, after the pause of a fortnight, had the prudence to Nov. 25. yield. She revoked her former orders; she even submitted to court the favour of the people, by ordering the sum originally demanded to be reduced. After these concessions the public business proceeded; and,

[1] D'Ewes, 107. I have inserted this speech, to give the reader a specimen of the queen's eloquence. She seems to have thought it beneath her to speak officially in the language of ordinary men. On all similar occasions she employs such quaintness of expression and such studied obscurity, that it is almost always difficult to comprehend her meaning.

as soon as a fifteenth and tenth, with a subsidy, had been voted, the parliament was dissolved. On that occasion she took her leave of the two houses in a sarcastic and uncourteous speech, in which she warned them never more to trifle with the patience of their sovereign.[1] CHAS. II. A.D. 1565. Jan. 2.

The parliament was scarcely dissolved, before the attention of Elizabeth was called towards Scotland, by a succession of events scarcely to be paralleled in history. The murder of Riccio had disappointed the hopes of Darnley. Instead of obtaining the matrimonial crown, and with it the sovereign authority, he found himself without power or influence, an object of scorn to some, and of aversion to others. Mary, though she might forgive, could not forget the outrage which he had offered to her. Neglecting his advice, she formed a new administration, in which to Huntley, whom she had appointed chancellor, and Bothwell, the hereditary admiral of Scotland, she added her brother Murray, and Argyle, who had married the sister of Murray. There existed, indeed, several causes of dissension between Murray and Bothwell;[2]

[1] D'Ewes, 117. Journals of Commons, 76, 78. Camden, 120. She suspected all who were warm on this subject of being more friendly to Mary than to her. "If," she says in a paper written by herself, "these fellows were well answered, and paid with lawful "coin, there would be no more counterfeits among them."—See Archæolog. xviii. 242.

[2] As Earl Bothwell will frequently claim the notice of the reader in the following pages, it will be proper to state that he succeeded his father Patrick in 1556. Though he was a Protestant, he supported the queen's cause during the war with the lords of the Congregation, and was the person who intercepted the money sent to them from Elizabeth. After the return of Mary to Scotland, he was imprisoned by order of Murray, but released on condition that he should quit the kingdom. In France he obtained the post of captain of the Scottish guard, but returned to his native country some time before the marriage with Darnley, and was now one of

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566. but she prevailed on them to be reconciled; and at their joint intercession she pardoned Maitland, notwithstanding the warm opposition of Darnley. This imprudent prince threatened, in his vexation, to kill Murray; and soon afterwards absenting himself from court, refused to return, till three of the chief officers of state should be excluded from the royal councils. In his residence at Stirling, he formed the capricious design of leaving the kingdom. Lennox, his father, unable to dissuade him, wrote to the queen, at whose invitation he consented, though with reluctance, to repair to Edinburgh. Having endeavoured in vain to change his resolution, Mary led him before the council, and, holding him by the hand, conjured him to detail his complaints, and not to spare her, if she were the cause of offence. In his answer he exonerated her from all blame;[1] but on every other

Aug. 2, 4.

Sept. 22.

Sept. 29.

the most powerful noblemen in the kingdom, being warden of the marches as well as high admiral. See a memorial, which, after his escape from Scotland in 1567, he addressed to the king of Denmark, on the eve of Twelfth-day. It has been preserved in the royal Swedish library, at Drottningholm, and was published in "Les "Affaires du Comte de Bothwell." Edin. 1829. An English translation, from which I shall quote hereafter, was given in the New Monthly Magazine for June, 1825.

[1] Keith, 345, 351. At this time, and for two months before, Buchanan represents the queen as living in the most shameful adultery with Bothwell. Now it is impossible to reconcile such an assertion with the testimony of those who were present when Mary exhorted Darnley to explain his motives of discontent. "Her "majesty said, that she had a clear conscience, that in all her life "she had done no action which could anywise prejudge his or her "own honour; nevertheless, as she might, perhaps, have given offence "without design, she was willing to make amends as far as he "should require; and therefore prayed him not to dissemble the "occasion of his displeasure, if any he had, nor to spare her in the "least matter." He would not at all own that he intended any voyage, or had any discontent, and declared freely, "that the queen "had not given him any occasion for any." "We testify, as far as "things could come to our knowledge, he has had no ground of "complaint; but on the contrary, that he has the very best of

point was sullen and reserved. Returning, however, to Stirling, he acquainted her, by letter, that his grievances might be reduced to two heads; the want of authority, and the neglect which he experienced from the nobility. She replied, that the first proceeded from his own fault, since he had employed the authority with which she first intrusted him against herself; and that he could not expect the nobility to love and honour a prince who never sought to deserve their affection or respect. CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

The queen, with the lords of the council, repaired to Jedburgh to hold the court, called the Justice Ayre.[1] Here she was seized with a dangerous fever; on the seventh and eighth days she lay for several hours in a state of insensibility, and so slender were the hopes of her recovery, that the lords resolved, in the event of her death, to proceed to Edinburgh, and settle the government; a resolution which, if it had been executed, would undoubtedly have excluded the Oct. 17.

"reason to look upon himself as one of the most fortunate princes "in Christendom, could he but know his own happiness."—Lords of Council, October 8; Keith, 349. Maitland sent a copy of this statement to the archbishop of Glasgow. From his letter it appears that Mary desired the lords of the council to subscribe it, and forward it to the king of France, the queen-mother, and the cardinal of Lorrain. It is, however, evident, that he meant it to be considered as detailing the truth.—Laing, ii. App. 73. And it is confirmed by other letters from Du Croc and from Melville.—Keith, 345, 350.

[1] Those who represent Mary as enamoured of Bothwell attach much importance to a visit which she paid to him from Jedburgh. On the 8th he had been wounded in the hand by an outlaw; and, if we may believe them, her love induced her that instant to take a dangerous journey to see him. But Chalmers has shown that she allowed eight days to pass; and that it was on the 16th that she rode from Jedburgh to Hermitage Castle, a distance of twenty English miles, and returned the same day. Her visit might be for a political purpose, as he was her lieutenant on the borders, and as she ordered a "masse of papers" to be forwarded to him the next day.—Chalmers, i. 191; ii. 12.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566. king, and placed the regency in the hands of Murray. During the intervals between the fits, Mary edified the assistants by her piety, composure, and resignation. She recommended, by letter, her son to the protection of the king of France, and of the queen of England; and sending for the lords, exhorted them to live in harmony with each other, required them to watch with care over the education of the young prince, and solicited, as a last favour, liberty of conscience for their countrymen who professed the Catholic faith, the faith in which she had been bred, and in which it

Oct. 26. was her determination to die.[1] On the ninth day, however, the symptoms were more favourable; she began to recover slowly; and the king, who had been sent for at the beginning of her illness, at length paid

Oct. 28. her a visit, but departed on the morrow.[2]

Nov. 20. As soon as the queen was able to mount her horse, she proceeded along the banks of the Tweed to Berwick, and thence to the castle of Craigmillar,

Nov. 26. where she was joined by Darnley. But no advance was made towards a reconciliation. He was too proud to submit; she too suspicious to trust him. The delicacy of her health added, perhaps, to the anxiety of her mind; and she was often heard to lament that she had not died of the fever at Jed-

Dec. 2. burgh.[3] Her situation did not escape the eyes of Murray and Maitland, the enemies of Darnley, who had accused the former of a design to assassinate him, and had demanded, as the price of his return to

[1] See the original letter in Keith, App. 133—136; Camden, 130. Maitland attributes her fever to anxiety of mind, caused by the behaviour of Darnley.—Laing, ii. App. 74.

[2] Du Croc, the ambassador, says of the king's conduct, c'est une faute que je ne puis excuser (133).

[3] Keith, Pref. vii.

court, that the latter should be dismissed from the office of secretary.[1] As soon as the king departed, they formed the following plan, by which they might both secure themselves from his hostility, and obtain a pardon for their associates still in exile. Their hopes were founded on the persuasion that Mary would cheerfully purchase, at any price, a divorce from the man who had so cruelly offended her; and that the consent of the other noblemen might be won, if it were rewarded with an act of parliament, confirming to them the several grants which had been obtained from the improvident liberality of the queen. With this view they opened the design separately to Huntley, Argyle, and Bothwell; and all five waited in a body on Mary. Maitland, having reminded her of the injuries which she had received from Darnley, and of the obstinacy with which he persevered in his misconduct, conjured her, in the name of all present, to give her consent to a divorce. At first she discovered no disapprobation of the proposal, provided it might be done according to law, and without prejudice to the right of her child. But soon she asked, whether it were not more advisable that she should retire for a while, and reside with her relations in France; perhaps Darnley, thus abandoned to himself, might learn to reform. Maitland replied that they could find the means of freeing her from him without prejudice to the rights of her son; and that Murray, though as scrupulous for a Protestant as she was for a Catholic, would look through his fingers at their doing, and say nothing against it. Mary ended the conference with these words: "I will that ye do nothing "through which any spot may be laid to my honour

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

[1] Keith, 351.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

"or conscience; and therefore, I pray you, rather let "the matter be in the state that it is, abiding till God "of his goodness put remedy thereto."[1]

This answer of the queen put an end to the project of divorce; and the lords reverted to another scheme, which had been previously agitated, that of assassination. Bothwell took upon himself to perpetrate the crime; the others to save him scathless from the consequences. A bond was drawn by Sir James Balfour. It styled the king a young fool and proud tyrant, expressed the determination of the subscribers to prevent him from obtaining the rule over them, obliged them to remove him by some expedient or other, and made each declare that he would repute "the "deed his own," by whomsoever it might be done.[2] This instrument was signed by Huntley, Argyle, Bothwell, Maitland, and Balfour. Whether Murray added his name may be disputed. To me he appears to have acted with his usual duplicity; he would remain neuter; "would neither help nor "hinder."[3]

[1] Of this conversation there can be no doubt. It was brought forward by Huntley and Argyle, to prove that Murray was the original proposer of the plan to get rid of Darnley, and consequently had even then an eye to the subsequent murder. In his answer he passes it over; and, by his silence, appears to acknowledge its accuracy. It is probably to this meeting at Craigmillar that the Spanish ambassador alludes, when he writes that "many had "sought to engage her in a conspiracy against her husband, but "that she gave a negative to every point."—Memorias, 319.

[2] Ormiston's confession in Laing, ii. 322.

[3] It is difficult to doubt the sincerity of Ormiston in his confession. According to him, Bothwell declared, that "the haill lords in "Craigmillar, all that wes ther with the queen," had determined on the death of Darnley.—Laing, ii. 320. But Bothwell might exaggerate, and Murray himself maintains that he signed no bond there.—Goodall, ii. 321. I have, therefore, adopted the deposition of Paris: il ne veult n'ayder ne nuire.—Laing, ii. 299. That deposition was plainly made to propitiate Murray; it therefore says

CHAP. II. A.D. 1566.

From Craigmillar, the queen proceeded to Stirling, where the royal infant was baptized. Though Darnley was in the castle, he did not appear. Elizabeth had forbidden her ambassador at the baptism, the earl of Bedford,[1] to give him the title of king; and Du Croc, the French agent, had received an order not even to speak to him till he should be reconciled to the queen. When the rejoicings were over, Bedford and Castelnau, each in the name and by the command of his sovereign, solicited the return of Morton, and was seconded by the prayers of Murray, Bothwell, and the other lords. Mary could no longer refuse; a pardon for the banished earl and his seventy-six associates was granted, on condition that they should not return to Scotland during the two following years; and Darnley, either to show his displeasure, or through fear for his life, left the court the same day, and retired to his father's residence in Glasgow.[2]

Dec. 17.

Dec. 24.

Before the lords would intercede in favour of Morton, they had required and received his subscription, and the subscriptions of the other exiles, to the bond devised at Craigmillar. In a few days they again solicited in his favour; and Mary consented that he might return to his native country, but under an obligation not to approach within seven miles of

as little against him as was possible; and yet amounts to an acknowledgment that he was privy to the plot, and had no objection to its success.

[1] He took with him as a present a font of gold; the countess of Argyle was godmother, as proxy for Elizabeth.—Keith, 360.

[2] Ibid. vii. 429. Chalmers, 175, 342. Bothwell assumes to himself the merit of obtaining the pardon of the exiles, who "placed," he says, "great reliance on me, on account of the favour bestowed "on me by her majesty, and of the free access which I had to her; "the which I had acquired solely by the faithful services I had performed, as well in the wars of her late mother, as in her own."—Bothwell's Memorial, 526.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1567.

the court.[1] The moment he entered Scotland, Bothwell and Maitland hastened to meet him; they consulted together at Whittingham, near the Lammermuir hills; and the murder of Darnley formed the subject of their deliberation. When they separated, Morton proceeded to St. Andrew's; the others returned to Edinburgh, accompanied by Archibald Douglas, who was soon remanded with this message from Maitland: "Schaw the erle Morton, that the "quene will hear no speech of that matter appointed "unto him." When the messenger complained of its obscurity, he was told that it would be sufficiently intelligible to his master.[2]

Jan. 20.

It chanced that at this time the small-pox was prevalent in Glasgow, and that Darnley took the infection. When the news reached Edinburgh, Mary sent her own physician to her husband, with a message that she would shortly visit him herself.[3] This promise she fulfilled; their affection seemed to revive; and they mutually promised to forget all former

Jan. 4.

Jan. 24.

[1] Compare the letter of Douglas, Robertson, ii. App. xii., with the confession of Morton, Laing, ii. 354. When the lords proposed the divorce to Mary, at Craigmillar, they made the return of Morton an indispensable condition; had they proposed the assassination to her, they would have done the same. Her delay in granting the pardon, and the restrictions which she successively appended to it, show that no such thing had taken place. If it had, she would certainly have permitted him to return to the court at once.

[2] Ibid.; Arnot, 389, and the letters of Bedford, January 9, and of Drury, January 23, in Chalmers, ii. 227. Goodall, i. 282. If we may believe Morton, he refused to concur in the murder, unless Bothwell should procure him permission from the queen. This was promised, but not effected. One thing, however, is plain, that he permitted Douglas, his confidential friend, to act as his substitute. —See his confession, Bannatyne, 494; and Laing, ii. 354; and the letter of Douglas, Robertson, ii. App. xii.

[3] These particulars, from the letters of Drury and Bedford, prove the falsehood of Buchanan's account.—Chalmers, ii. 178.

causes of offence.[1] From Glasgow, as soon as he was able to remove, she returned with him to Edinburgh, and, probably to preserve the young prince from infection, lodged him, not in Holyrood House, but in a house[2] without the walls, belonging to the provost of St. Mary's, generally called "the Kirk of Field." Here it was that the conspirators prepared to execute the plan which had been discussed, and probably arranged, in the meeting at Whittingham. By a door in the city wall, their agents obtained access to the cellar of the house, undermined the foundations in several parts, and placed a sufficient quantity of gunpowder under the angles of the building.[3] The queen visited her husband daily, gave him repeated testimonies of her affection, and frequently slept in the room under his bed-chamber. She had promised

Jan. 28. Jan. 31.

[1] It seems to me proved beyond contradiction, that a reconciliation had, apparently at least, taken place. In addition to the testimonies collected by other writers, Mr. Chalmers adduces that of Clernault, taken at Berwick, February 12: "La bonne intelligence "et union en quoi lad' dame, et led' sr roy vivoient depuis trois "semaines. Telle malaventure est advenue au temps que sa mate "et le loy estoient au meillure mesnage que l'on pouvoit desirer" (ii. 114).

[2] Mary had suffered severely from the small-pox when she was in France.—See Lettres de Marie, with a note, by Prince Labanoff, vii. p. 304.

[3] In the confession of Powrie, Hay, Hepburn, and Paris, wrung from them by torture, it is said that the powder was placed, between ten and eleven at night, in the queen's bed-chamber, under the king's, while she, with her attendants, were with him in his own room.—Laing, ii. 269, 279, 284, 304. I see not what advantage could be derived from this story; yet it is difficult to believe it. Not only do the time, the distance, and the manner of conveying the powder, render it improbable; but the council, in their letter of the 10th, Mary, in hers of the 12th, and the trial of Morton, prove that the house was blown up from the very foundation, so that not one stone was left upon another. Hence the real mine must have been made in the cellar.—Keith, pref. viii. Laing, ii. 97, 351. Chalmers, ii. 445.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1567.

to be present at a masked ball, to be given on the 9th of February, in honour of the marriage of Sebastiani and Margaret Carwood, two of her servants; and the certainty of her absence on that night induced the conspirators to select it for the execution of the plot.

On the ninth, Mary went as usual to the Kirk of Field with a numerous retinue, remained in Darnley's company from six till almost eleven o'clock, and at her departure kissed him, and taking a ring from her finger, placed it on his. She then returned by the light of torches to Holyrood House; on the termination of the ball, a little after twelve, she retired to her chamber; and about two the palace and city were shaken by a tremendous explosion. It was soon ascertained that the house of Kirk of Field had been blown up with gunpowder; that the dead bodies of the king and his page Taylor were lying uninjured in the garden; that two men had perished among the ruins; and that three others had escaped with very little hurt.[1]

Feb. 9.

Feb. 10.

This tragical event has given birth to an interesting controversy, whether the Scottish queen was or was not privy and consenting to the death of her husband. Few questions in history have been more keenly or

[1] Keith, pref. viii. Laing, ii. 95. But how happened it that Darnley's body was uninjured? Morette, envoy of Cosmo de' Medici, and living in Edinburgh at the time, supposes that Darnley, alarmed at the noise made by the conspirators, rushed out of bed and out of the house into the garden, where he was seized and strangled. —See Lettres de Marie, vii. 108. The king's body was, by order of the council, embalmed, and interred by night in the royal tomb, by the side of the queen's father, James V., on February 15. To inter by night and without any ceremony had become customary in Scotland since the Reformation, of which numerous instances may be seen in Balfour, ii. 250, 251, 252, 319, 320. The slander of Buchanan that he was deposited by the side of Riccio is exposed by Keith, 368.

more obstinately discussed; but her advocates, as well as her accusers, occasionally leave the pursuit of truth for the pursuit of victory; their ardour betrays both parties into errors and misrepresentations; and the progress of the historian is retarded at every step by the conflicting opinions and insidious artifices of his guides. In the conduct of Mary, previously to the murder of Darnley, I see nothing that can fairly impeach her character. There is no credible evidence that she was cognizant of the design, much less that she was the accomplice, of the assassins. But in her behaviour subsequently to that event, there is much of more questionable tendency, which, in the supposition of her guilt, will be considered as the consequence of the crime; in the supposition of her innocence, may be explained away by a reference to the difficulties of her situation. I shall narrate the facts with impartiality; the reader must draw his own conclusion.[1]

It is acknowledged by all that the queen acted, at first, as an innocent woman would have acted. She lamented the fate of a husband, to whom she had been so lately reconciled. She expressed a suspicion, that it had been intended to involve her in the same destruction; and she repeatedly announced her resolution to take ample vengeance on the authors of

[1] The reader will see, that hitherto I have made no reference to the celebrated letters, on which depends the credit due to Buchanan in his history and detection, and to De Thou, who was led by Buchanan. Those letters will be noticed in the following chapter: here I will only remark, that, if Mary and Bothwell, with a view to their own marriage, had resolved to remove Darnley out of the way, poison would have offered them an expedient equally sure, and infinitely less dangerous. It is strange that they should have refused that which would probably have concealed the murder of the sick man, and have adopted that—the blowing up of the house—which must publish the murder to the whole world.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1567. so flagitious a crime. Her chamber, according to custom on the death of a king, was hung with black; the light of the day was excluded; and in darkness and solitude she received the few who were admitted to offer their respects or condolence. Letters, describing the manner of the murder, the state of her mind, and the measures which she intended to pursue, were written to the foreign courts;[1] judicial inquiries were instituted, and a proclamation was issued, offering rewards in money and land, for the discovery and apprehension of the murderers, with a full pardon to

Feb. 12. any one of the party who would accuse his accomplices. The same noblemen continued to attend the royal person; and Murray, who the day before the murder had left the court on a visit to his wife, rejoined his colleagues in the council.

Men, in accordance with their political partialities, attributed the murder to the leaders of one or other of the two great factions which divided the nobility.

Feb. 16. After a few days, placards appeared on the Tolbooth and the walls, charging the crime on Bothwell and several of his dependants, "the queen herself assenting "thereto." A proclamation immediately called on the accuser to come forth with his proofs, promising him impunity for his person, and the reward which had

Feb. 19. been offered for the discovery. He replied by other placards, demanding, as previous conditions, that the money should be deposited in safe hands, and that certain persons, servants about the palace, should be taken into custody. It was soon ascertained that the writer was James Murray, a partisan of the faction hostile to the court; but though the most diligent

[1] Keith, pref. viii. Anderson, ii. 202. Laing, ii. 97. Killegrew's letter in Chalmers, i. 209.

search was made after him, he had the good fortune to escape discovery.[1] CHAP. II. A.D. 1567.

By this time the earl of Lennox, the father of Darnley, who had come to an understanding with Argyle, Morton, Murray, and their friends,[2] took up the charge where it had been left by its anonymous author. In a long correspondence with Mary, he requested her not to wait the meeting of parliament, but to imprison the persons mentioned in the placards, and to examine them before a convention of the nobility. The parliament she had called already, the imprisonment she refused, on the mere authority of an anonymous handbill. Let him come forward himself, and she would deal with those accused by him according to law. When his answer, in which, instead of accusing as guilty, he only denounced these persons as vehemently suspected of the murder, was laid before the council, Bothwell haughtily declared that he would not allow such suspicion to remain a blot upon his character, and demanded a speedy trial. The twelfth of April was appointed, and due notice sent to the earl of Lennox. Murray, with his characteristic caution, solicited leave to travel; and, intrusting his interests to the care of Bothwell, departed from Edinburgh on his way to France; and Lennox, aware of his inability to support the charge, or intimidated by the superior power of the accused, though he had left Glasgow to attend the trial, wrote from Stirling on the eve of "the assize," to request an adjournment.[3] He had already solicited the good

Feb. 20. March 17. March 24. April 8. April 11.

[1] Cabala, 136. [2] Ibid. 137.

[3] Anderson, i. 36, 54; ii. 111. Howell, St. Trials, 907. It is generally supposed that the trial was granted at the denunciation of Lennox, but Bothwell asserts that it was granted at his own request

CHAP. II. A.D. 1567. April 8.

offices of the queen of England; and Elizabeth instantly despatched a messenger to Mary with a letter of most affectionate advice, which did equal honour to her head and her heart. Had it been perused by the Scottish queen before the trial, it would probably have opened her eyes to the abyss which yawned before her; but there is reason to believe that it was not suffered to reach the hands of that unfortunate princess till after the acquittal of the accused.[1]

April 12.

The provost of Berwick, the bearer of the letter, had reached Holyrood House at an early hour in the morning. But the object of his mission was already known; he was treated with incivility, and could procure no one to inform Mary of his arrival. After a delay of some hours, Maitland took the letter, and returned with an answer, that the queen was still in bed, and that no one dared to disturb her repose. Bothwell immediately proceeded to the Tolbooth, surrounded by two hundred soldiers and four thousand gentlemen. Maitland rode by his side; Morton accompanied him, and supported his cause; the earl of Argyle presided as hereditary justiciary of Scotland.[2]

(Memor. 527); and, that this is true, appears from the fact, that of the seven denounced by Lennox, he alone was tried. It is moreover plain that Lennox shrunk from the trial because he had no proof. "I find," says Killegrew, the English envoy, "suspicions and no "proofs."—Chalmers, i. 209. Lennox denounced the persons charged in the handbills; yet no proof was afterwards brought against any one of them, though several other persons were tried, and executed for the murder.

[1] This letter is in Robertson, i. App. xix. Archbishop Beaton, from Paris, had equally exhorted her to clear her character by the prosecution of the murderer.—Keith, pref. ix. But I do not believe Melville's story respecting Lord Herries (Melv. 78); for that nobleman appears in every instrument about this time as a supporter of Mary and Bothwell.

[2] See Drury's letter of April 15, Chalmers, ii. 245—247. Mr. Laing will not allow that Morton was at all concerned in this trial

A motion to postpone the trial for forty days was made and rejected; and, as no prosecutor appeared, the jury having heard the indictment, and evidence to show that Bothwell could not have been at the Kirk of Field at the time of the explosion, returned a verdict of acquittal. He then, "according to usuage "and the laws of war," by proclamation, and papers affixed to the cross and the church doors, reasserted his innocence, and offered to fight, in single combat, against any native of Scotland, France, or England who should dare to charge him with the murder.[1]

To clear herself from suspicion, it was incumbent on the queen to bring the real assassins to justice. This had been remarked to her by Elizabeth; it had been urged in the most impressive terms by her ambassador at Paris, and it had, on more than one occasion, been acknowledged by Mary herself. But how, her adversaries ask, did she proceed? She refused the reasonable petition of her father-in-law; she granted to Bothwell a collusive trial; and she persisted in maintaining his innocence on the credit of an acquittal, which, to every impartial observer, furnished additional confirmation of his guilt. Would she have

(i. 70); yet I see not how he can elude the testimony of Belforest (Jebb, i. 403); or of Camden,—Mortonio causam ejus sustinente (i. 138). Morton had been appointed one of the jury, but paid the forfeit, under pretence that he was a kinsman of Darnley.—Drury, ibid.

[1] Anderson, ii. 107. Bothwell's Mem. 528. He maintains, of course, that he was innocent, and charges the murder on "the "traitors," that is, the exiles. It may have been that he was not present at the perpetration of the crime; for, as there was a guard of fifty men at Holyrood House, it is difficult to conceive how any man could have entered after the explosion without being challenged; and it was proved by the testimony of Huntley that, hastening with the intelligence to Bothwell's apartment, he found him and the countess in bed. But this is no proof that the murder was not committed with his foreknowledge, or by his agents.

CHAP. II. A.D. 1567.

acted in a manner so fatal to her reputation, had she not been impelled by some powerful motive, such as consciousness of crime, or a licentious passion for the person of the murderer? In reply, her advocates remark, that in this statement much has been taken as fact which never was proved; but, even in the supposition of its truth, it should be remembered that Mary was a young and defenceless woman in the hands of a faction; that she could receive no information, could adopt no measure, but through the medium of her council; and that this council was composed of the very persons who are said to have planned the murder, or directed its execution, or given bonds to screen the perpetrators from punishment. It was no wonder, then, if in such circumstances, and surrounded by such interested and unprincipled advisers, she were taught to believe that Bothwell was innocent, that the accusation had been suggested by the malice of his enemies, and that Lennox requested a delay, because he found himself unable to substantiate the charge.

Two days after the trial the parliament was opened, and its proceedings appear to cast some light on the real object of those who had procured the death of Darnley. Though Mary had reigned but a short time, she had already bestowed, at the solicitation of her ministers, two-thirds of the property of the crown on them and their adherents. They held, however, these acquisitions by a precarious tenure; because the law of Scotland gave to the sovereign the power of revoking all such grants at any time, before he or she had reached the age of twenty-five years. It was known that the late king expressed himself with much warmth against the improvident bounty of his wife. In the preceding April, Mary had made a partial revocation;

and, as the present was the last year in which she could exercise that right, there could be little doubt that Darnley, had he lived, would have urged her to a general act of resumption. The great object of the lords was to take away the very possibility of such a measure. In the short space of three days, the lands forfeited by Huntley were restored, the grants made to Murray, Bothwell, Morton, Crawford, Caithness, Rothes, Semple, Herries, Maitland, and others, were confirmed; and the power of revocation was taken both from the queen and her successors. In addition, the act abolishing the papal jurisdiction, which had been made by the convention in 1560, but had never received the royal assent, was now ratified; but to it was appended, probably to silence the objections of the queen, a permission for all Scotsmen to serve God according to the dictates of their consciences.[1] Lastly, the record of the trial of Bothwell was brought into the house, the proceedings were revised, and the verdict declared just and legal.[2]

April 15.

On the day after the dissolution of parliament, twenty-four of the principal peers, comprising, as well those who had been distinguished by their loyalty, as those who had repeatedly borne arms against their sovereign, assembled and subscribed a new bond. They were made to assert their belief of the innocence of Bothwell; they obliged themselves to defend him

April 20.

[1] Keith, 378; Act Parl. ii. 547. It is singular, that Anderson published the confirmation to Bothwell, and omitted the others (i. 117).

[2] This was asserted by Mary, and a number of Scottish lords in their instructions to Mary's agents in England.—Goodall, ii. 163, 342, 361. Mr. Laing tells us, that it was a direct and wilful falsehood (i. 69, note). Yet Bothwell, without any concert with her or them, asserts the same in his Memorial, p. 521. There cannot be a doubt of the fact.

CHAP II. A.D. 1567.

against all calumniators, with their bodies, heritages, and goods; and they promised upon their consciences, and as they would answer to the eternal God, to promote a marriage between him and the queen, as soon as it could be done by law, and she might think convenient; and for that purpose to aid him with their votes, their lives, and their goods, against all mortals whomsoever. If they believed him to have been a party to the murder, a more disgraceful association does not sully the page of history.[1]

The next day Mary rode to Stirling, to visit her infant son, whom, for greater security, she had lately intrusted to the custody of the earl of Marr. On her return, she had reached the Foulbrigge, half a mile from the castle of Edinburgh, when she was met by Bothwell at the head of one thousand horse. To resist would have been fruitless; and the queen, with her attendants, the earl of Huntley, Maitland, and Melville, was conducted to the castle of Dunbar. There she remained a captive for the space of ten days: nor was she suffered to depart till she had consented to become the wife of Bothwell.[2]

April 24.

To explain this extraordinary transaction, her enemies represent it as a collusion between the parties. They had long been lovers; they wished to marry; and a show of violence was made to save the reputation of the queen.[3] It is, however, but fair to listen to her

[1] Keith, i. 383. Anderson, i. 107. The subscribers comprise all the bishops that were in parliament but one, all the earls but two, and all the lords but five. It is stated by Camden, that the bond was devised by the parties to the murder, ne Bothwellus, promissis nuptiis exclusus, eos ut totius sceleris architectos insimularet.—Camden, i. 138.

[2] Scottish Acts, iii. 8.

[3] To these insinuations may be opposed two powerful objections. 1. Mary's enemies never spoke of the collusion for many months

own story. Mary tells us, that previously to her visit to Stirling, Bothwell had dropped some hints of marriage, but received so resolute an answer, that he saw nothing but force could win her consent. On her return towards Edinburgh, he seized her person, and conducted her, against her will, to Dunbar. There he renewed his suit with more earnestness, conjured her to attribute his violence to the ardour of his affection, and laid before her the bond of the lords with their respective signatures. Mary perused it with astonishment and dismay; yet her repugnance was not subdued. It did not arise, if we may believe her own assertion, from any suspicion that the earl had been guilty of the murder of Darnley—she had been taught, by all around her, to believe the charge groundless and vexatious; but she considered the match unequal, and the proposal premature; and she wished, before she entered on another marriage, to take the advice of her friends both at home and abroad. She had at first cherished a hope that the news of the outrage would summon an army of loyal subjects to rescue her from her prison; but day passed after day; no sword was drawn in her cause, no attempt made in her favour; the apathy of the lords proved to her that the bond

afterwards. In their different proclamations, and in the act of parliament against Bothwell, they considered her captivity as real, and effected by superior force.—Anderson, i. 131, 136, 139, 142. Act Parl. iii. 6—8. 2. To prove the collusion, they produced a paper said to have been written or signed by her, and purporting to be a license to the lords to subscribe the bond on the 20th. Now, if this license were genuine, no appearance of force would have been necessary; she had already declared to the whole nobility of Scotland that she was willing to marry the earl. If it be not, how can we assent to an hypothesis, the framers of which were compelled to commit an act of forgery for its support? Bothwell, in his own narrative, says nothing respecting the seizure of the queen or her consent, but attributes the marriage to the advice of the subscribers to the bond (521).

CHAP II. A.D. 1567

was genuine, and that she was a captive in the hands of an audacious subject. Bothwell insensibly assumed a more decisive tone; "nor did he ceise till, by persua-"sion and importunate sute, accompanied with force, "he had driven her to end the work."[1] The meaning of the words "accompanied with force," she has not explained; Melville, her servant and fellow-prisoner, assures us that it was the violation of her person.[2]

Bothwell now left the fortress; but it was to conduct the captive queen from one prison to another, from the castle of Dunbar to that of Edinburgh. Here she pleaded for time, that she might obtain the consent of the king of France, and of her relations of the house of Guise. But his ambition was too impatient to run the hazard of delay. The only remaining obstacle, his existing marriage with Janet Gordon, sister to the earl of Huntley, was in a few days removed. Both had already sued for a divorce, she on the ground of adultery in the consistorial, he on that

May 3.

[1] Anderson, i. 89, 102. In a letter to the archbishop of Glasgow (May 27), she asserts that this statement contains "the verie "trewth of the mater." It should, however, be remembered, that it was made under the necessity of saying something in her own vindication. "The event indeed is strange, and utherwiss nor "ye wuld have lukit for."—Illust. 177.

[2] Melville, 80. Melville's testimony is corroborated by Mary's enemies in their answer to Throckmorton (Keith, 418; Stevenson, 233), that she was compelled "by fear, force, and, as by mony con-"jectures may be weil suspected, other extraordinary and mair un-"lauchfull meanys to become bed-fellow to another wyves husband." In the sonnets attributed by them to Mary is the following allusion to the same thing.

——"Il se fit de ce corps possesseur,
Du quel alors il n'avoist pas le cœur."

If the sonnets are forgeries, this passage is quite in keeping with the above answer to Throckmorton; if they are genuine, it completely negatives the assertion that Mary had previously lived in adultery with Bothwell, and had assented to the murder of her husband, that she might marry her paramour. It may be that by "unlauchfull meanys" they hinted at magic.

of consanguinity in the archiepiscopal court; in both a favourable judgment was pronounced; and it was hoped that the objections of the Protestants would be silenced by the decision of the one, those of the Catholics by that of the other. Exactly one month after his trial, Bothwell led the queen to the court of session, where, in the presence of the judges, she forgave the forcible abduction of her person, and declared that he had restored her to the full enjoyment of liberty; the next day she created him duke of Orkney; and having granted a pardon to the lords who had subscribed the bond, was married to him by a reformed minister, in the hall of Holyrood House.[1] Still, however, she remained a prisoner. Guards continually watched the passages leading to her apartments; no person could obtain access to her, except in the presence of Bothwell; and the harsh treatment which she daily experienced convinced her that she had given to herself a cruel and imperious master. The unhappy queen was often discovered in tears. But though her present sufferings might teach her to perceive and lament her past indiscretion, she could then possess no foresight of that long train of evils with which it would be followed.[2]

May 12.

May 15.

[1] Anderson, i. 87, 136. Melville, 80. Laing, i. 94. There is an unimportant controversy, whether the marriage ceremony was performed by a priest as well as a minister.

[2] Anderson, i. 132, 136. Melville, 82. Stevenson, 234. Du Croc apud Von Raumer, ii. 100. Du Croc visited her on the day of the marriage. She was very sorrowful, and declared to him that she should never be cheerful again, that she had no other wish but to die.

CHAPTER III.

CAPTURE, IMPRISONMENT, AND RESIGNATION OF MARY STUART—SHE SEEKS AN ASYLUM IN ENGLAND—CONFERENCES AT YORK AND WESTMINSTER—PROJECT OF MARRIAGE BETWEEN MARY AND THE DUKE OF NORFOLK—HE IS IMPRISONED—REBELLION IN THE NORTH—BULL OF EXCOMMUNICATION AND DEPOSITION AGAINST THE QUEEN—TROUBLES IN THE NETHERLANDS—AND IN FRANCE.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567.

WHOEVER is conversant with the history of this period must have observed that, in the judgment of most of the Scottish lords, self-interest was paramount to every other consideration. Hence their conduct perpetually varied with the varying course of events; every new prospect of gain or aggrandisement suggested new counsels and new crimes, and the most solemn engagements were both contracted and violated with equal precipitancy. We have seen the same individuals binding themselves by their duty to the eternal God, first to prevent the marriage of Darnley with their queen, then to raise that nobleman to the throne, and, lastly, to procure his assassination. The reader will not be surprised, if he now beholds them entering on a fourth association, to punish the murderer whose deed they had promised "to reckon as their own," and then to transfer the sovereign authority from the queen to a regent of their own creation.

Of the lords who, though not in the secret of the murder, had been induced by fear or interest to sub-

scribe the bond in favour of Bothwell's marriage, many were at the very time ashamed of their own conduct. In such a state of mind, they viewed his subsequent seizure of the royal person with feelings of suspicion and resentment. Meetings were held; projects of opposition were suggested; and inquiry was made what part the queen of England would take in the approaching contest.[1] The question awakened in her ministers fresh hope of effecting that which the war of the Reformation had failed to accomplish. But Elizabeth checked their eagerness; she refused to interfere with an armed force; and merely signified her assent that the earl of Bedford might repair to Berwick, and "comfort" the discontented lords. Cecil, however, though he dared not give any express assurance of support, acquainted them with his opinion, that the nobility of Scotland, but particularly those who had previously bound themselves to Bothwell, must immediately take up arms, if they wished to avoid the infamy of being considered accomplices in his guilt.[2]

It has been assumed by some writers that, when Morton and Maitland joined with Bothwell in plotting the death of Darnley, they had two other objects in view, which they carefully concealed from their colleague; the dethronement of Mary, and the subsequent elevation of Murray to the regency. But philosophical historians are apt to attribute to the foresight of politicians those counsels which are, in reality, suggested by the passing events of the day. The dissension between Mary and her husband had produced suspicion; by her precipitate marriage that

[1] By Kirkaldy of Grange, apud Chalmers, ii. 236, note *a*.
[2] Chalmers, ii. 235, note *x*. Robertson, i. App. No. xx.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567.

suspicion was ripened into conviction; and the associates of Bothwell saw that, unless they joined his opponents, they must submit to share his infamy, perhaps his punishment. The earls of Morton, Marr, and Athol, the lords Home, Semple, and Lindsay, the lairds of Tullibardine and Grange, met at Stirling, and were joined by Montrose, Glencairn, Ruthven, and

June 5. Sinclair. Their plan to surprise Bothwell and the queen at Borthwick was defeated by a rapid flight to

June 11. Dunbar; but they entered Edinburgh, and by proclamation charged the earl with the murder of Darnley, the treasonable seizure and marriage of the queen, and an intention of gaining possession of the prince, that he might murder the heir apparent, as he had already murdered his father.[1]

In four days Bothwell ventured with his friends to meet the more numerous and well-appointed force of his enemies on Carberry Hill, at no great distance from

June 15. Edinburgh. From an early hour in the morning till nine at night, the two armies faced each other. It was in vain that Du Croc employed his authority and eloquence to reconcile the parties. The queen offered a full pardon to the confederates, on condition that they should disband their forces; they required of her to come over to the nobility, and leave Bothwell to suffer the punishment of his crime. He offered to fight singly with Morton, or any one of his accusers.

[1] Anderson, i. 128—134. It appears, from the letter of Beaton, that Bothwell escaped from Borthwick in the morning, before the arrival of the lords; that Mary remained there all the day, with about half a dozen servants; and that at night she rode away in male attire, was received at a short distance by Bothwell, and conveyed by him to Dunbar.—Laing, ii. 109. This fact proves incontestably that the queen was unwilling to separate from Bothwell, whether her reluctance arose from attachment, or from the causes which in a few pages she will assign.

The challenge was accepted first by Tullibardine, afterwards by Lindsay; but, for reasons with which we are unacquainted, no combat followed.[1] At length it was agreed that he should retire without molestation; that the queen should return to her capital, and that the associated lords should pay to her that honour and obedience which was due to the sovereign. She gave her hand to Kirkaldy of Grange, and was by him conducted to the army of his colleagues, in whose name Morton, bending his knee, said, "This, madam, "is the place where you ought to be; and we will "honour, serve, and obey you as ever the nobility of "this realm did any of your progenitors." The agreement was mutually ratified, and the army returned towards Edinburgh.[2]

[1] According to Bothwell himself, the queen and her gentlemen considered the opposite champion beneath Bothwell in point of rank and ancestry: but he adds, "I so persuaded her and them, by the "many reasons I urged, that they eventually consented that the "combat should take place. I repaired to the field of battle to "await the arrival of my antagonist, where I remained till very late "in the evening; he did not, however, make his appearance, as I "will prove, when necessary, by the testimony of five thousand "gentlemen, upon pain of forfeiting my life." The queen wished to prevent the effusion of blood, and desired him to retire, promising to return to him, or to write to him at Dunbar; and then the agreement in the text was made, both by word of mouth and in writing (p. 530, 531). According to Du Croc, the objection on the ground of inferiority was made only to Tullibardine, and the combat with Lindsay did not take place, because the queen refused her consent. He also mentions her promise to Bothwell.—See Von Raumer, ii. 102. Murray, in his proclamation in the king's name of the 14th of May, 1568, says that Bothwell "refused singular combat of a "lord and baron of parliament, howbeit before he had offered him-"self thereto by his cartel and proclamation."

[2] Goodall, ii. 145, 164. Laing, ii. 116. This connivance at the escape of Bothwell appears to confirm the opinion that the confederate lords chiefly aimed at the deposition of Mary, and the establishment of a regency. Had they taken possession of him, though they might not have so easily deprived the queen of her crown, they could have immediately effected what they professed to

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567.

An hour did not elapse before Mary learned that she was a captive in the hands of unfeeling adversaries. At her entrance into the city, she was met by a mob in the highest state of excitement; her ears were assailed with reproaches and imprecations; and before her eyes was waved a banner, representing the dead body of her late husband, and the prince her son on his knees exclaiming, "Revenge my cause, O "Lord." The provost imprisoned her in an upper story of his own house, and gave orders that no person, not even her maids, should have access to her.

June 16. During the two-and-twenty hours that she was confined in this solitary cell, the unhappy queen abandoned herself to the terrors which her situation inspired. From the street she was repeatedly seen at the window, almost in a state of nudity; and was often heard to call on the citizens, conjuring them to arm and deliver their sovereign from the cruelty of traitors. About nine the next evening she was con-

June 17. ducted to Holyrood House, and after a respite of an hour was conveyed by a body of four hundred armed men out of the capital. Athol rode on one side of the captive, Morton on the other; and at some distance they delivered her to the custody of Lindsay and Ruthven, by whom she was led to the castle of Lochlevin, the residence of William Douglas, uterine brother of Murray, and heir presumptive to Morton, and placed under the care of Margaret Douglas, the mother of Murray, and, as she pretended, not the mistress, but the real wife of King James.[1]

have in view, the punishment of the murder, and the dissolution of the marriage.

[1] Keith, 403. "Sche came yesterday to ane windo of hir "chalmer, that lukkit on the hiegait, and cryit forth on the pepill, "quhow sche was haldin in prison, and keepit be hir awin subjects,

Elizabeth had been informed of this extraordinary revolution by an envoy from the insurgents, whom she received with the strongest expressions of displeasure. The insult offered to the Scottish queen was, she contended, common to every crowned head; it resulted from the doctrines of Knox, which she had so often condemned; it required severe and immediate punishment, that subjects might learn to restrain their unhallowed hands from the anointed persons of their sovereigns. The queen spoke her real sentiments; but there is reason to believe that the secretary did not participate in the feelings of his sovereign. The enemies of Mary were the very men whom he had hitherto patronized; and the revolution which they had recently effected, offered the surest means of accomplishing the favourite object of his policy, the extinction of the French, and with it of the Catholic interest in Scotland. Four weeks after the captivity of Mary, Throckmorton appeared in Edinburgh in quality of ambassador from Elizabeth. From the lords he was instructed to demand immediate access to the royal prisoner, and her restoration to the free

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567.

July 12.

"quha had betrayit hir. Sche came to the said windo sundrie "tymes in sa miserable a stait, hir hairs hangand about hir loggs, "and hir breest, yea the maist pairt of all hir bodie, fra the waist "up, bair and discoverit, that na man could luk upon hir bot sche "movit him to pitie and compassion. For my ain part I was "satisfeit to heir of it, and meight not suffer to see it."—Beaton's letter of the 17th. Laing, ii. 117. Mary accused Maitland and Kirkaldy as the cause of her misfortunes. Randolph afterwards says to them: "You two were the chief occasions of the calamities, "as she hath said, that she is fallen into. You, lord of Liddington, "by your persuasion and counsel to apprehend her, to imprison her, "yea, to have taken presently the life from her; and you, lord of "Grange, by your solicitation, travel, and labour to bring in others, "to allow thereof, and to put in execution that, which by the "other, you, lord of Liddington, was devised."—Strype, ii. App. 20

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567. exercise of her authority; to Mary herself he was to offer the powerful protection of the English queen, who, if her Scottish sister would ingenuously confess the truth, would either contrive the means of saving her honour, in case her honour were at stake, or punish her guilty subjects for the false charges which they had brought against her; and to both he was to recommend a reconciliation on the basis of the divorce of Mary from Bothwell, the prosecution of the latter for the death of Darnley, and a general amnesty for all other offences. This was the avowed object of his mission; but another and more important object was, to oppose any plan for the conveyance of Mary's infant son to France, and to procure, if it were possible, the removal of the young prince to England, that he might be brought up under the care of his kinswoman, the English queen. There cannot be a doubt that Elizabeth herself sought with sincerity the liberation of Mary; she could not brook the notion that subjects should presume to incarcerate or punish their sovereign; but there is reason to believe, that such was not the object of her ambassador, or of her favourite ministers. Throckmorton maintains, indeed, that he complied with his instructions to the letter; but he owns, at the same time, that he disapproved of the policy of the queen, and most of his despatches betray a secret effort to divert her from her purpose, by artfully insinuating, that her demands are more likely to provoke the death, than to procure the liberty of the royal captive.[1] He was received with great respect by the lords in the capital, but to his repeated proposals they declined to return

July 13.

[1] See them in Stevenson's "Illustrations of the Reign of Queen "Mary," p. 190—301.

any answer, until the greater part of their associates should return from the country. An assembly of the kirk had been called to meet in Edinburgh ; and the town was soon filled with the most violent and fanatic of the party. CHAP. III. A.D. 1567. July 15.

Knox and the ministers proved from texts and instances in the Scriptures that sovereigns like other men were amenable to justice ; the populace, especially the women, called for the death of the queen, because she had no more right to commit adultery and murder than the meanest of her subjects ; and so great was the excitement, that Throckmorton pretended to fear not only for the life of Mary, but even for his own safety, as he was known to have come to Scotland that he might negotiate in her favour.

In the mean time the lords of the secret council had devised three instruments, by one of which Mary was made to resign the crown in favour of her infant son ; by the second Murray was appointed regent during his minority ; and by the third, certain noblemen were named counsellors to supply the place of Murray, until his return from France, and in case of his death. A deputation, at the head of which was Lord Lindsay, the keeper of Mary, the sternest and most unfeeling of the saints, was now sent to Lochlevin, to require the queen's signature to these instruments, under a threat of bringing her, in case of refusal, to trial on three charges,—of tyranny towards her people, of adultery with Bothwell and others, and of participation in the murder of her husband. With the deputies came also Melville, the bearer of letters from Throckmorton, and from some of the lords, the secret friends, as they pretended, of the captive, July 24.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567. July 25.

advising her to consent without hesitation; because no deed, executed under such circumstances, could be binding in law. She had just perused these letters, when Lindsay entered, threw the instruments on the table, and bade her either sign them, or prepare to die as the assassin of her husband. The unhappy queen burst into tears; then, hastily recovering herself, took up the pen, and subscribed her name without looking at the contents.[1]

That Mary had acted under restraint and through fear for her life, no man could doubt; yet the lords waited the next day on Throckmorton, and unblushingly announced to him through Maitland the conclusion to which the captive queen had come "upon "her owne voluntarye advise; that is to say, findinge "herself bothe in helthe unmeete to take the care "and governaunce of the realme, and also unfortunate "in th' administration thereof, and beinge very de- "sirous to see her sonne the yonge prynce setled in "her seate in her lyffe tyme, she had commanded "them under her hande wrytinge to proceed to his "coronation, as a thynge that she should take the "most pleasure to see;" and in conclusion they invited him to attend at the ceremony as the representative of his sovereign. He refused. Elizabeth,

[1] Keith, 430—434. Ils m'ont menassé de me tuer, si je ne signoys.—Anderson, iv. 31, par. ii. 86. There was another paper signed by the queen, an order to Thomas Sinclair, keeper of the privy seal, to seal the other three instruments. He refused, because the queen was in "ward." But Lindsay took the seal from him, "and wyt company of folkis compellit him to scill the same."—See his protest in Blackwood's Magazine, ii. p. 32. It may be some confirmation of this that Throckmorton informs Elizabeth that Murray's appointment to the regency was "signed with Mary's "hande, and sealed with her *prevye seale*."—Stevenson, p. 289.

he said, wished the young prince as much honour as was wished by any one among them; but she would never consent that the son should depose his mother from her throne.[1] CHAP. III. A.D. 1567.

Three days later, the royal babe (he had attained the age of thirteen months) was sworn, anointed, and crowned in the High Church in Stirling. It was a most singular ceremony. The infant lay unconscious on the throne; the deeds lately executed by his mother in prison were publicly read, and the lords Lindsay and Ruthven deposed upon oath that they had been executed by her freely and willingly in their presence. But how was the young king to be sworn? The earl of Morton, one of the murderers of his father, came forward to take the coronation oath as the royal proxy. It had been improved by a few additional clauses binding the sovereign to serve the Eternal his God according to his holy word established in the kirk, to abolish and gainstand all false religion, and to root out heretics and enemies of God's worship convict of the same by the judgment of the kirk. Knox preached the sermon; after which the unction followed, though it was loudly condemned by the new apostle as a mere Jewish rite. The lords, however, had insisted on it as necessary to introduce the new sovereign among *Christian* sovereigns, and to secure to him the veneration of the people. The coronation was performed by the bishop of Orkney, assisted by the laird of Dun and the superintendent of Lothian, holding the crown over the head of the infant. The Hamiltons and other partisans of the captive queen July 29.

[1] Stevenson, 250, 251.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567.

had been invited to attend, but refused to sanction her dethronement by their presence.[1]

The only thing now wanting to complete the revolution was the acceptance of the regency by the earl of Murray. The reader is aware of the dark and dissembling character of this statesman. During the last three months he had remained aloof in France, but now prepared to return home through England. His intention with respect to the regency he kept a profound secret within his own bosom; yet he was received at the court of Charles IX. as if he were already invested with the office, and accepted from that monarch a present of plate valued at fifteen hundred crowns, and the grant of a yearly pension of four thousand francs.[2] In England he seems to have condemned openly and severely the presumption of his Scottish friends in making a prisoner of their

[1] Keith, 437—459. Stevenson's Collections, 257, 286. Anderson, i. 44. If we may believe Throckmorton, a day or two after the ceremony the archbishop of St. Andrew's proposed to the lords of the secret council that they should put Mary to death in punishment of her crimes; after which all her party would join with them, for there would then be no cause for dissension between them. "This," observes Mr. Tytler, "is a new fact, involving a charge "of unwonted perfidy even in that age." To me it appears an atrocious calumny. The archbishop, during the absence of the duke of Chastelherault, was the leader of the Hamiltons; his devotion to the cause of the Scottish queen, both before and after this time, is proved by his continual efforts in her service, his letters to Throckmorton, and the cruel death which he suffered in reward of his loyalty. On what authority then is he now charged with perfidy to her? Upon hearsay only. The ambassador is told so by Tullibardine and Lethington, two of Mary's bitterest foes, and told so at a moment when it was necessary to raise doubts of the sincerity of the Hamiltons in the mind of Elizabeth; for the archbishop had sent to her the bond made by Mary's partisans to effect, if it were possible, the liberation of their sovereign on the very terms proposed by Elizabeth herself.—See Tytler, viii. 141—144; Stevenson, 199, 278, 287.

[2] Stevenson, 192.

sovereign—so much was perhaps necessary to propitiate the English queen; yet this did not prevent him on certain occasions from disclosing that new proofs had been discovered of the guilt imputed to his sister.[1] In Scotland he persisted in holding the same ambiguous language; he would have an interview with the captive at Lochlevin, before he would give a positive answer. To this the lords assented; and he hastened thither, having in his company Morton, Athole, and Lindsay. At the news of his arrival a gleam of hope shot across the mind of the unfortunate queen. Murray was her favourite brother. To her he owed his wealth, his honours, and his influence. She had formerly pardoned his treason and ingratitude, and restored him to the first place in her council.

August 9.

August 15.

[1] Thus his confidential servant was instructed by him to say that he (Murray) "did not a little mislike that the lords were so "far overshot, as to keep their mistress in durance, and that he "would be her true servant in all fortunes."—Stevenson, 192. But to the Spanish ambassador the earl was more communicative, evidently because he wished to prepare the king of Spain for the step which he contemplated. "He felt exceedingly for the im- "prisonment of the queen, but had always anticipated evil from her "connection with Bothwell. There was even then in existence a "letter, of three sheets of paper, written by her with her own "hand to Bothwell, in which she urged him to put in execution the "plan concerted between them for the death of Darnley, either by "giving to him a potion, or by burning him in his house. He had "not, indeed, seen the letter; but he knew the fact from one who "had read the original."—Gonzales, Apuntamientos, p. 75. This mention by Murray of Mary's supposed letter is important. It was afterwards sworn that the casket seized on the 20th of June contained eight letters, in Mary's hand, with sonnets, all corroborative of the guilt attributed to the queen; yet on the 30th of July, Murray appears to have heard of no more than one letter, evidently the first in the series of eight. Again, that letter there made mention of plans to make away with Darnley, either by poison or setting fire to the house, "quemando la casa;" but when the letter was published, not a syllable about the fire appeared in it. If the letters were fabrications, it would seem to follow that the form in which they were to be made public had not yet been finally settled.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567 —

Mary hastened to meet him, and, to her surprise, found him cold, formal, and reserved; her tears, caresses, and entreaties proved fruitless; she could not draw from him one consoling expression; and when they parted, she knew not whether to consider him a friend or a foe. After supper they met again; but Murray assumed a still sterner tone. He loaded his afflicted sister with reproaches, bade her repent and be patient, and dropped some distant hints of the bar and the scaffold. It was an hour after midnight when he left her with this ominous remark, that "she "had nothing to hope for but God's mercy; let her "seek that as her chief refuge." In the morning followed a third interview, in which the earl appeared a very different man. He affected to feel pity for her misfortunes, and expressed a wish to screen her from the vengeance of her enemies. To the queen, who had passed a sleepless night in anguish and terror, his softened and consoling manner made him appear an angel from heaven. She embraced him, kissed him, conjured him to assume the regency, that he might preserve her life and that of her son. To draw from her this request had been the sole object of his visit. He assented, after several refusals; but, at parting, bade her recollect that he was only one man; it was useless for him to insure her safety, unless she deserved it. If she should attempt to escape, or should raise disturbance against the government, it would not be in his power to screen her from punishment.[1]

August 19. From Lochlevin, Murray proceeded to Stirling, to

[1] Throckmorton's letter of the 20th of August, in Keith, 444—448. From whom Throckmorton received the account, we know not. He tells the queen that Murray informed him that he had also required his sister to desist from her inordinate affection for Bothwell, and her resentment against the lords (447).

visit the young king, and thence returned to the capital. Three days later a general meeting of the lords and citizens was held at the Tolbooth, in which the justice clerk, having first read aloud the instrument by which Mary had conferred on the earl the regency during the minority of her son, required him officially in their names to enter on the execution of that office. Murray, with ill-dissembled humility, excused himself in a long disqualifying speech: he dared not impose on his shoulders a burthen to which he felt that he was unequal. The justice clerk renewed the requisition; it was inforced by the cries and solicitations of all present; and it soon became visible that the earl was suffering or pretending to suffer a violent conflict within himself, and could not long withstand the voice of his country. At length he gave a tardy and reluctant assent, took the oath,[1] and was proclaimed regent at the High Cross. It was a farce which could blind none but the zealots of the party. Subsequently he seems to have forgotten it; and, as often as he condescended to justify his assumption of the office, he was wont to allege that his consent had been wrung from him by the prayers and tears of Mary in her prison at Lochlevin.[2]

August 22.

[1] The oath was the same as had been taken at the coronation, ending thus: "All these thinges above wrytten I faithfullie affirm "with my solemnyt ayth." He was then told to lay his hand upon the bible with inclination of the body, and to sing the lxxii. psalm.—Stevenson, 287.

[2] See especially his proclamation of August 22, "for obedience "thairof he hes acceptid and ressavit the charge."—Keith, 454. Mary had maintained liberty of conscience for all persons, as far as the fanaticism of the preachers would permit; but Murray entered on the regency by taking the following oath: "And out of this "realme of Scotland and impyre thairof I sall be cairful to ruite "out all hereticks and enemies to the trew worschip of God, that "sall be convict be the trew kirk of God of the forsaid crimes."—Ibid. 423.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567.

With respect to Bothwell, he had been suffered to retire without molestation from Carberry Hill to his castle of Dunbar. Some days later, leaving the castle to the care of a trusty partisan, he traversed the west and north of Scotland to consult with the friends of Mary, by whom it was resolved that, instead of attempting her liberation by open force,—which would only endanger her life from the malice of her enemies,—Bothwell should proceed through Denmark to France, and solicit the advice and aid of the French monarch. The earl was preparing for his voyage in one of the Shetland isles, when a hostile squadron appeared under Kirkaldy and Tullibardine.

August. He put to sea; his pursuers overtook him; but the engagement was interrupted by a sudden storm, which cast him on the coast of Norway. At first he was treated as a pirate; but on the discovery of certain papers, containing the patent creating him duke of Orkney, a letter from the queen, and the recent proclamation against him, he was sent to the

Dec. 20. court at Copenhagen. Frederic refused to see him; and the castle of Malmoe in Schonen was appointed

1568. Jan. 5. for his residence, or rather confinement. Thence he wrote to the king a vindication of his conduct, and afterwards made to him, as envoy from Mary, an

Jan. 13. offer of the Orkneys and the Shetland isles, to be annexed to the crown of Denmark and Norway, in return for aid to be furnished to that unfortunate princess. The offer was neglected, and the fugitive remained a prisoner in the fortress.[1]

To return to Mary, the reader will recollect that one of the avowed objects of the associated lords was to free her from the thraldom of Bothwell; the

[1] Bothwell's Memorial, Affaires du Comte, Append. 539.

moment she came into their hands, they immured her in a prison, and in a few days deprived her of her crown. In vindication of their conduct, they alleged that they had offered to obey her as their sovereign, provided she would abandon Bothwell, and consent that he should suffer punishment as the chief murderer of Darnley.[1] On her refusal, they had placed her under confinement, with the hope that solitude and reflection would wean her from that guilty passion which she had so long indulged: but her obstinacy seemed to increase; it endangered the safety of the prince, of the lords, and of the state; it reduced them to the painful necessity of depriving her of the sovereign authority, and of transferring it to her son. Mary replied that these were mere pretexts; she had offered to convene the three estates, to submit to them the two questions of the validity of her marriage and the punishment of the murderers, and to abide by their determination, whatever it might be. To such a proposal no reasonable man could object; but her adversaries had required her assent to demands the most unjust and unnatural. It could not be expected that a queen in her situation (she knew herself to be pregnant) should disown her husband, and by that act bastardize her child, and forfeit her honour, at the sole will of an armed faction.[2]

[1] "To punish the king's murder, *chiefly* in my Lord Bothwell." —Laing, i. 104. This proposal was made to her by Maitland, an accomplice. It would seem that Bothwell was to be punished, and his accomplices were to escape.

[2] "She hath sent me word that she will rather dye, grounding "herself upon thys reason, that takynge herself to be seven weekes "gon with chylde, by renouncynge Bodwell she shoulde acknow- "ledge her selfe to be with chylde of a bastarde, and to have "forfayted her honoure, which she will not do, to dye for yt."—

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567. — August 22.

Murray, on his assumption of the regency, had informed the ambassador that the lords cared not for the censure of foreign powers, nor would they condescend to vindicate their conduct; but some months later it was deemed advisable to throw off the mask. A silver casket, which Mary had inherited from her first husband Francis, and which she is said to have given to Bothwell, had in the month of June come into the possession of the earl of Morton.[1] In it, if we may believe him, were found several papers in the handwriting of the queen, which proved her to have been an accomplice in the crime. The importance of the discovery was secretly communicated to the chiefs of the party, and to the queen of England:[2] but no particulars were divulged before the month of Decem-

June 20.

Dec. 4.

Throckmorton, July 18. Stevenson, 221. Robertson, App. xxi. Prince Labanoff states, on the authority of Le Laboureur, that Mary, a little before her escape from Lochlevin, was delivered of a child, a daughter, who was privately conveyed to France, and afterwards became a nun in the convent of Notre Dame, in Soissons.—Lettres de Marie, ii. 63, note.

[1] There is something to excite suspicion in the history of this casket. It was said to have been taken on the person of Dalgleish, a servant of Bothwell, on the 20th of June. On the 26th he was examined before Morton, Athol, the protector of Maitland, and two others. No question was then asked, no mention was made of the casket. How are we to account for this silence? Does it not seem to follow that Morton was ignorant of the existence of the casket and its contents six days after that on which, if we believe his oath, they came into his possession? For, undoubtedly, when a man was put to the torture to make him confess, every question was asked which could bear upon the charge. If, on the contrary, it be pretended that questions were asked, but that they and the answers returned to them were suppressed, is not such suppression a sufficient proof that, instead of confirming, they would have overturned the story told by Morton?

[2] The first notice which we have of these letters is from Throckmorton, who writes on the 25th of July, that they boast of being able to prove the queen guilty of the murder, by the testimony of her own handwriting, as also by sufficient witnesses. Now letters to this purpose they afterwards produced, but not witnesses.

ber, when a resolution was taken to accuse Mary of adultery and murder; to maintain that she had suffered herself to be seduced by Bothwell, and afterwards had consented to the death of her husband, that she might be able to marry her paramour; and to declare that her captivity and destitution were "in her "own default; in so far as by divers her privy letters, "written and subscribed with her own hand, and sent "by her to James Earl Bothwell, and by her ungodly "and dishonourable proceeding in a private marriage, "suddenly and improvisedly thereafter, it was most "certain that she was privy, art and part, and of the "actual devise and deed of the murder of the king "her lawful husband." This act of the council, but with some alterations, was adopted by the parliament; Dec. 10. and to it was added a second of forfeiture against Bothwell, enumerating, among his other offences, the violence which he had undutifully employed to compel his sovereign to marry him. It seems not to have occurred to the framers of these acts, that they appear to stand in opposition to each other. If Mary's letters were genuine, if she was "swa blindlie affectionate to "the private appetyte of that tyrane," neither her conveyance to Dunbar, nor her subsequent marriage, could have been the effect of compulsion, but must have proceeded from her own will and consent.[1]

The Scottish queen was still confined in the towers of Lochlevin, under the jealous eye of the lady Douglas, mother to the regent, and formerly mistress to James V.[2] It was in vain that, to recover her liberty,

[1] See the two documents in Goodall, ii. 62—69, and on the variations between the act of council and the act of parliament, note (I).

[2] Je suis guestee de si pres, que je n'ay loisir (d'escrire), que

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568. she made repeated offers to her brother and the council. They had resolved that she should never leave her prison alive; and if we may believe her own assertion, had seriously listened to several proposals for the shortening of her days. But she possessed resources beyond the control of her enemies; and her beauty, her manner, and her misfortunes won for her an invaluable partisan in George Douglas, the brother of the regent. By previous concert with Beaton, a trusty servant of the queen, who lurked in the nearest villages, he introduced a laundress at an early hour
March 25. into the bedchamber of Mary, who exchanged clothes with the woman, and, carrying out a basket of linen, took her seat in the boat. She had almost reached the opposite bank, when, to secure her muffler from the rudeness of one of the rowers, she raised her arm to her face, and a voice immediately exclaimed, "That "is not the hand of a washerwoman." She was recognized, and conveyed back to Lochlevin; George fled from the resentment of his relatives, and left the task of liberating the queen to an unsuspected associate, an orphan boy of the age of sixteen, known by the name of the little Douglas.[1]

Five weeks elapsed before the new confidant found
May 2. an opportunity of making the attempt. One evening, while the lady Douglas sat with the whole household at supper, having adroitly drawn the keys from the table, he called the queen, and Kennedy, one of her maids, led them out of the castle, locked the door after them, and threw the keys into the lake. A boat had been prepared; the preconcerted signal was made;

durant leur diner, ou quand ils dorment, que je me resleve: car leurs filles couschent aveques moy.—Lettres de Marie, ii. 69.

[1] Drury's letter of 3rd of April, in Keith, 460.

and George Douglas and Beaton received the fugitives on the beach. Mary slept that night at Niddry, a house belonging to Lord Seton; the next morning she rode in safety to the castle of Hamilton, and revoked the resignation of the crown which she made in her prison at Lochlevin.[1]

At this intelligence, the royalists crowded round their sovereign; nine earls, nine bishops, and eighteen lords offered her their congratulations and services; May 8. and the queen became acquainted, for the first time, according to her advocates, with the real history of the murder of Darnley, and of the guilt of Bothwell.[2] To her brother the regent, who chanced at that moment to be in Glasgow, she made repeated offers of settling every cause of dissension in a free parliament, and of delivering up to justice every person whom he should accuse of the murder, provided he would do the same by those whom she might also accuse.[3] Morton and Maitland were alarmed; they imprisoned her messengers, and proclaimed her adherents traitors. Mary was on her road to the castle of Dunbarton, when May 13. Murray, with a small but disciplined force, appeared on an eminence called Langsyde. At the sight her followers, consulting their loyalty rather than prudence, rode in confusion to charge the rebels; they were received with coolness and intrepidity; and, after a sharp contest, turned their backs and fled. From the field of battle, the disconsolate queen rode to the abbey of Dundrennan, in Galloway, a distance of sixty Scottish miles, in the course of the same day. Her adversaries followed in every direction; but she eluded their pursuit, resumed her flight the next evening, and

[1] Anderson, iv. par. ii. 52, 87. Keith, 471. Jebb, ii. 230.
[2] Anderson, iv. par. ii. 82. [3] Anderson, iv. 31, 32.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568. on the following morning, after a hasty repast, expressed her determination to seek an asylum in the court of her good sister the queen of England. Her best friends remonstrated; and the archbishop of St. Andrew's conjured her on his knees to change her resolution; but Mary trusted to the advice of the French ambassador, and to the assurances which she had received; commissioned Beaton to take back to Elizabeth a diamond ring, the pledge which that princess had given her of affection and support; and

May 16. crossing the Solway Frith in a fishing-boat, landed with twelve attendants in the harbour of Workington,

May 20. whence she proceeded through Cockermouth to Carlisle.[1]

May 14. In Scotland, on the day after the action at Langsyde, the regent published a long and artful proclamation in the name of the infant king. Having related the murder of his father, and the marriage of his mother, James was made to proceed thus: "In what "state our innocent person then stood, the eternal "God best knos; our father lately murdered, and our "mother coupled with him that was the chief authour "of that mischievous deed. But divers of our nobility, "to keep us from falling into the merciless hands of

[1] Anderson, iv. 333. Keith, 477—483. Jebb, ii. 268. Memorias, 329. Mary, in her letter to Elizabeth, from Workington, says: Je suis en piteux estat non pour royne, mays pour gentillfame; car je n'ay chose du monde que ma persone comme je me suis sauvee.—Ellis, ii. 236. Lettres de Marie, ii. p. 75. In consequence of this hint Elizabeth sent to her dos camisias ruines, dos pares di zapatos, y dos piezas di terciopelo negro.—Despatch of Guzman de Silva, the Spanish ambassador at Simancas. Mary herself in a letter to the cardinal de Lorraine says, La Royne d'ici m'a envoye ung peu de linge, et me fournit un plat. Le reste je l'ay empruntay, mais je n'en trouve plus.—Ibid. p. 117. To Catherine de Medicis, Je n'ay pas un soul. . . . Je n'ay seulment pas de quoy ascheter une chemise.—Ibid. p. 129.

"them whilks slew our father, to separate that Tyrane "and godless man fra the queen our mother, and "to put our person in safety, convened in the field "aganis the said earl, whence he escaped, and our "said mother refusing to leave the ungodly and un-"honest company of the murderer, and minassing sic "as had been careful of our preservation, she was put "in surety, until further deliberation. Shortly there-"after God manifested the murder more clearly; and "not only the report of divers actually present thereat, "and many other things gave presumption, but *writ* "declared the truth. Always the queene seeing how "contrariously things succeeded, and how evil her "subjects liked of her regiment, demitted the crown "in our favours, and we were lawfully inaugurate "with the crown; and our dearest cousin James earl "of Murray sworne and admitted in regent unto our "age of xvii. years. Which our coronation is by the "acts of ane lawful free and plain parliament declared "to be rightly done, as much as if she, the time of the "said coronation, had been departed forth of this mortal "life; and in the same it was found that all things "done on occasion of taking the queen our mother on "the xv of June last bepast, and detaining her within "the fortalice of Lochlevin sensyne, and in time "coming, were done to our grief in her default. . . . "Yet, certain men conspired her liberty, convoyed "her to Hamilton, and induced her to attempt by "force to bereave us of our crown; but God hath "granted us the victory in the preservation of our "innocent person, and the room and authority wherein "he hath placed us. What womanly mercy was in "the person of her that, alas, thought the shedding of "Scottish blood a pleasant spectacle? What favour

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

"can men look for at her hands that stirs sedition "against her only lawful son! What security can "godly men expect, sche bearing regiment, by wha's "occasion our maist dear father, being a portion of "her own flesh, was slain!" Wherefore he concludes with charging all the lieges, as they shall answer to Almighty God, and under the penalties of treason, to give no aid or countenance to his said mother, or to any conspirators acting under her orders, or in her favour.[1]

During these transactions it was difficult for an ordinary observer to unravel the intricate policy of the English cabinet. Elizabeth had publicly professed herself the friend of the Scottish queen, declared to foreign princes that she would restore her to her throne, forbidden her ambassador to assist at the coronation of the prince, refused to Murray the title of regent, and demanded, in a tone of authority, the liberation of Mary. But on the other hand, her ministers were intimately leagued with the enemies of that princess; they dissuaded their sovereign from appealing to arms, under the pretence that such an appeal would be the death-warrant of the royal captive; they imparted advice and information to Murray and his council; and they encouraged him in the persuasion that his proceedings were in reality approved by the English queen.[2]

But Mary's unexpected arrival in England opened

[1] Abridged from the original "imprentit be Robert Lekprenik, "printer to the King's Majestie."

[2] "Although," says Murray to Cecil, "the quene's majestie, "your mistress, outwardlie seam not altogether to allow the pre-"sent state heir, yet doubt I not bot her heines in hart lykis it "well aneuch. I have had infallible experience of your gude wil. "in especial."—Haynes, 462.

new prospects to Cecil and his confidential friends in the council. They rejoiced that the prey, which they had hunted for years, had at last voluntarily thrown herself into the toils; but they were perplexed to reconcile their designs against the royal fugitive with the appearance of decency and justice. After repeated meetings, it was concluded, that to allow her to proceed to any foreign court, or to solicit aid of any foreign prince, would be to risk all the advantages who had been obtained by the treaty of Leith; that, if it were advisable to replace the sceptre in her hands, it ought to be by the influence of Elizabeth alone, and under restrictions which would leave her only a nominal authority; but that to detain her in captivity for life would be the most conducive both to the security of their sovereign, and to the interests of their religion.[1] The accomplishment of this object was intrusted to the dark and intriguing mind of Cecil. Mary was at first assured that Elizabeth would vindicate the common cause of sovereigns, and reinstate her in her former authority, upon condition that she would be satisfied with the aid of her good sister, and reject that of France or Spain, or any other power.[2] Next it was intimated to her that the English queen had determined to essay the influence of advice and authority, before she would have recourse

[1] Anderson, iv. 34—44.

[2] The first message to Mary was to obtain from her a promise not to solicit or receive any aid from France: "which, if she will "do, she shall then be assured that we will have the principal "regard to her state, so as her subjects may be reduced to acknow- "ledge their dutie without shedding of blood, or trouble of her "realm: and, if they will not yield to reason by treaty or per- "suasion, we will give to her such aid as shall be requisite to com- "pel them."—Instructions to Leighton, Anderson, iv. 27. Mary assented, but could never obtain the promised aid.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

to arms and bloodshed; lastly, a hint was given that, in order to justify the interposition of Elizabeth, it was desirable that the Scottish queen should clear herself from the odious crimes with which she had been charged by her enemies.

Mary, immediately after her arrival, had demanded permission to visit Elizabeth, that she might lay before her the wrongs which she had suffered, and explain to her the deceit, the calumnies, and the crimes of her adversaries. But a personal interview might have proved dangerous, not only to Murray and his party, but to their friends in the English cabinet. Cecil suggested to his mistress, that, as a maiden queen, she could not in decency admit into her presence a woman charged with adultery and murder. Let her first call on Mary to disprove the accusations of her opponents before a board of English commissioners. She had a right to require it; for history showed that the Scottish was subject to the English crown, and that all controversies between the people and the king or queen of Scotland ought to be decided in the court of their superior lord. She had now an opportunity of exercising that right; and it would prove dishonourable to her, if she omitted to avail herself of it.[1] He found it more easy to persuade Elizabeth than Mary. The latter objected to everything in the shape of a trial. It would consume time, of which every moment was to her of importance; because delay served to consolidate the usurped authority of the regent, and, by disappointing the hopes, to diminish the number, of her adherents. Then from whom did the proposal originate? From one who had always proved her

[1] Anderson, iv. 26, 37, 103, 105.

bitterest enemy. Who would name the commissioners, and superintend the proceedings? A party that from the beginning of her reign had constantly given advice and support to her rebels. And who was to be her judge? She could acknowledge none. She was an independent queen, and would never submit to place the crown of Scotland at the foot of a foreign power. She therefore requested permission to return again into Scotland, or to pass through England to France. The demand was reasonable; but it accorded not with the views of the council, and was at first eluded, and afterwards refused.[1] CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

This crooked policy, which gradually extinguished all her hopes, wrung from Mary expostulations, written with the dignity of a queen and the spirit of an innocent and injured woman. She observed that, if she had come into England, it was in consequence of the assurances which she had received during her confinement in Lochlevin; and that, if Elizabeth now repented of her promises, the least she could do was to allow the princess whom she had deceived to seek for aid in other courts. That the English queen had received into her presence the bastard Murray, notwithstanding all the crimes of which he had been guilty, and yet she refused to receive a queen and a relation, who felt and was ready to prove herself innocent. Her enemies were not to expect that she would answer their false accusations in prison; they were her subjects, not her equals; she would rather die in captivity than condescend to

[1] Laing has converted Mary's objections to the proposed trial into so many proofs of her guilt. Undoubtedly, if she were conscious of guilt, she would object to a trial. But I think it evident, that, if she were innocent, she still had many reasons to refuse such an inquiry as was proposed.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

put herself on the same footing with them. But let Elizabeth restore her to liberty, and she would prove her innocence in the presence of her good sister, as her friend, but not as her judge. Let Morton and Maitland, the real contrivers of the murder of her husband, be sent for; it would give her pleasure to meet them face to face before the queen of England, and before the nobility of England in Westminster Hall. In a word, let Elizabeth remain neuter: she asked no more; her sister might, if she pleased, withhold the aid which at first she had promised; at least let her not furnish aid to the rebels who had driven their sovereign from her throne.[1]

June 20.

These remonstrances produced but little effect. After long consultation it was agreed that Mary should not be received at court till her innocence had been fully established; that her request to leave the kingdom should not be granted; and that she should be transferred from Carlisle to Bolton Castle, as a

July 15.

place presenting fewer opportunities of escape. At Carlisle she had been nominally free; at Bolton she

[1] See the correspondence in Anderson, iv. 47—97; in Haynes, 465, 466, 469; in Ellis, ii. 231—251; and in Lettres de Marie, ii. 143—165. I observe, that in these letters Mary continually declares herself innocent, and accuses Morton and Maitland of the murder of Darnley, and of falsely charging her with it. "Ils ont "devisé et favorisé, et signé et assisté à un crisme, pour le me "mettre fausement à subs."—Anderson, iv. 30. "Withal she "affyrmed that both Lyddynton (Maitland) and the lord Morton "were assentyng to the murder of her husband, as it could well be "proved."—Ibid. 54. "Desire my good sister, the queen, to "write that Lithington and Morton (who be two of the wisest and "most able of them to say most against me) may come, and then "let me be there, in her presence face to face, to hear their accusa- "tions, and to be heard how I can make my purgations; but I "think Lithington would be very loth of that commission."—Ibid. 90. "Estant innocente, comme Dieu mercy je me sents, ne me faites "vous pas tort de me tenir icy."—Ibid. 96. "Mon innocence et la "fiance que j'ai en Dieu m'assurent."—Haynes, 465.

found herself literally a prisoner; she therefore asked, and her few friends in the council asked, on what principle of justice she was detained in captivity. She was not the subject of Elizabeth. She had come into the kingdom at the express invitation of the queen; since her arrival she had transgressed no law, had committed no offence. It was answered, that she had formerly asserted a right to the crown, and, if she were set at liberty, might re-assert that right; that, a Catholic herself, she could rely on the aid of all Catholics at home and abroad; and that her succession to the throne, if it were ever effected, would prove the ruin of the Protestant cause, both in England and Scotland.[1] On these grounds her enemies persisted in requiring an investigation into her past conduct, with the hope of being able to disgrace her; and she persisted in the rejection of a proceeding, which she deemed derogatory from her dignity and injurious to her honour. At length the subtlety of Cecil suggested an expedient, which equally served his purpose,—an investigation, not into the conduct of Mary, but of her enemies; who, if they could justify their conduct to the satisfaction of certain English commissioners, should be allowed to retain their estates and honours; if not, should be abandoned to the justice or the mercy of their sovereign. If the Scottish queen would approve of this proposal, a treaty might be negotiated, by which Elizabeth should undertake, on certain conditions, to reduce her subjects to obedience, and to replace her on the throne.[2] Mary, contrary to the opinion of her best advisers, assented to this expedient. Murray dared not refuse;

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

July 28.

[1] Anderson, iv. 102—106.
[2] Anderson, iv. 109. Goodall, ii. 183. Haynes, 467.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

and the place of conference was fixed in the city of York.

The commissioners to hear this important cause were the duke of Norfolk, the earl of Sussex, privately favourable to Mary, and Sir Ralph Sadler, the known confidant of Cecil. The queen of Scots was represented by Leslie, bishop of Ross, the lords Livingstone, Boyd, and Herries, and three others. On the opposite part, Murray attended in person, with Morton, Lindsay, the bishop of Orkney, and the abbot of Dumfermlin, aided by Maitland and five

Oct. 4. other councillors. To adjust the preliminaries occupied several days. Mary insisted that the promise of the English queen to replace her on the throne should appear in the powers given to her commissioners; and Murray required a confirmation of the assurance, which he had already received, that the queen, if she were convicted of the charge, should never return to Scotland. These contradictory demands, which at once discovered the insincerity of the English cabinet,

Oct. 8. were ultimately granted;[1] and the commissioners of the Scottish queen, as plaintiffs, opened the charges against Murray and his associates; that they had risen in arms against their sovereign, had traitorously confined her in Lochlevin, and had, by intimidation, compelled her to resign her crown. It had been expected that Murray, in reply, would rest his justification on the part which it was pretended that Mary had acted in the murder of Darnley. But he sought to play a

Oct. 9. deeper and surer game. He waited on the English

[1] Anderson, iv. part ii. 25—41. Goodall, ii. 108—128. That Mary agreed to the conferences, on the express condition of being restored to her throne at their termination, is evident from Anderson, iv. 109. That a promise was given to Murray of the opposite tendency, is also plain from Anderson, iv. part ii. 11.

commissioners, and expressed his readiness to communicate to them, but in secret, and as to private individuals, the proofs of her guilt. They should recollect that the lives of himself and of his associates were at stake; that before they could appear as public accusers of their sovereign, they had a right to ascertain whether their proofs would be considered sufficient to establish the charge; whether, if it were established, the judges would pronounce sentence; and whether security would be given, that after sentence Mary should never be restored to her throne. He then laid before them translations of eight letters, supposed to be written by her to Bothwell, some before the murder of her husband, others before the seizure of her person; two contracts of marriage, said to have been signed by them both, and a collection of amatory sonnets, described as composed by her, and sent to her paramour. No answer given by the commissioners would satisfy his fears; and, at his request, they wrote to Elizabeth for additional instructions.[1]

That the cause of this delay might not be suspected, Murray now gave in a pretended answer to the charge. Oct. 10
His friends, he said, had taken up arms, not against the queen, but Bothwell, by whom she was controlled; they had afterwards "sequestrated" her, because she would not separate her cause from his; and had at last accepted, but not extorted, her resignation. To a plea so weak and unsatisfactory, the commissioners Oct. 16.
of Mary opposed a most victorious reply.[2]

[1] Anderson, iv. 41—63. Goodall, ii. 128—138. Robertson attributes these questions to Murray's knowledge of an intrigue of Maitland with the duke of Norfolk. But he had first put them in June, four months before, and received answers.—Goodall, ii. 75, 89. Robertson, i. No. xxv.

[2] Anderson, 64—70, 80—91. Goodall, 139—148, 162—170.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

In the mean time, York had become the scene of active and intricate negotiation. The Scots were divided into two parties, called the king's lords, and the queen's lords, at the head of which were the earl of Murray on one side, and the duke of Chastelherault, lately returned from France, on the other. Both of these earnestly desired a compromise. Murray knew that his charge against Mary would be met with a similar charge against his associates, and that her proofs were better able to bear investigation than his.[1] Should he fail, he would be left without resource to the vengeance of his sovereign; should he succeed, the sickly state of the infant king made it probable that, in a short time, his mortal enemy, the duke, would come to the throne. Hence he was willing to give up his proofs against Mary, to pronounce her innocent by act of parliament, and to allow her a considerable revenue from Scotland, provided she would either confirm her resignation of the crown, or, retaining the name of queen, consent to reside in England, and leave to him the title and the authority of regent. The duke, the next heir after the infant James, feared, on the contrary, the intrigues of Murray, and the hostile pretensions of the house of

They afterwards acknowledged that this was a fictitious plea, because they dared not put in their real answer. Yet they had solemnly sworn "to proceed sincerely and uprightly; and, for no "affection, malice, or worldly respect, to advance any thing otherwise than their own consciences should bear them witness before "God, to be honest, godly, reasonable, just, and true."—Anderson, 39.

[1] This, a most important fact in the controversy respecting the authenticity of the letters, is expressly asserted by one who was able to judge, the earl of Sussex. "Yf her adverse partee accuse "hir of the murther by producyng of her letters, she wyll deny "them, and accuse the moste of them of manyfeste consent to the "murther, hardely to be denyed; so as, upon the tryall on bothe "sydes, her proofes wyll judycyally falle beste owte, as yt is "thought."—Lodge, ii. 1, 2.

Lennox. He demanded that the queen should be restored to the crown; but was willing that the prince should be educated under the care of Elizabeth, and that the government should be conducted by a council of noblemen, in which every man should have that place which became his rank. "These parties," says the earl of Sussex, "toss between them the crown and "public affairs of Scotland, and care neither for the "mother nor the child (as I think before God), but to "serve their own turns."[1]

To prevail on Mary to accede to his terms, Murray employed the artful and intriguing Maitland. That statesman had already informed her, as a friend, of the charge to be brought against her, had secretly sent her copies of the supposed documents in a Scottish translation, and had exhorted her to adopt a compromise as the only expedient to preserve her honour.[2] To the duke of Norfolk he suggested, in the name of the regent, a marriage with the Scottish queen; assured him in private of her innocence, and intimated that a speedy termination of all differences could alone prevent the English ministers from publishing the defamatory documents.[3] Lastly, he attempted to persuade the bishop of Ross, that, if Mary would confirm her resignation made in Lochlevin, and marry

[1] See his very interesting letter from York, Oct. 22, Lodge, ii. 1, 2. Also another from Knollys, Robertson, i. No. 16. The duke of Norfolk also asserts the same. "Some seke hollye to sarve ther "owne partycular turnes, the wytche beying done, they care not "what becumes nether of quene nor kynge."—Goodall, ii. 157.

[2] Murdin, 52, 53. He assured Mary that he would not have come to York, had it not been to do her service.—Ibid. Yet the whole of his conduct tended to produce that which we learn from Sussex Murray wished to effect. Hence I have no doubt that his suggestions to her were made with the privity of the regent.

[3] Ibid. 164. See also State Trials, i. 92, 93, 94, where Norfolk, Murray, and Ross charge each other with the first proposal.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

the duke of Norfolk, the queen of England would replace her on the throne.[1]

These proceedings suggested to the fertile mind of Cecil the adoption of a new expedient, but an expedient so strange and unsatisfactory, that it provoked in those who were merely lookers on a suspicion that no favour was meant to be shown, no justice to be done, to the Scottish queen. Now that he was fully acquainted with the state of the conferences at York, the reluctance of the regent to bring forward the charge, the presumed insufficiency of his proofs, the project of marriage between Norfolk and Mary, and

Oct. 16. the multiplied intrigues of Maitland, he induced the council, instead of returning a direct answer, to reply that the questions of Murray contained several points which could not be elucidated by letter, and to require that two commissioners from each party, with Sir Ralph Sadler, should hasten to the court, to give to

Oct. 20. the queen the necessary information. Mary, though she felt surprise at this unexpected demand, expressed her satisfaction that the cognizance of her cause would at length come before Elizabeth herself. Murray, who was in the secret, signified his acquiescence, and at the same time solicited permission to attend the commissioners in person.[2]

Oct. 30. On their arrival a council was held at Hampton Court, in which it was resolved—1. That, to take from Mary's commissioners all pretext of evading the

[1] Robertson, i. App. xxvi. Murdin, 53.

[2] Anderson, ii. 93—96. Goodall, ii. 170—179. Murdin, 766. Mary gave new instructions to her commissioners the next day; in which she says, that if any subject be brought forward not comprised in their former instructions, they are not to answer till they know her mind; as they cannot confer with her now as they did during the conferences at York.—Ibid. 350. I think this is not fairly stated by Laing, i. 580.

defence of their mistress, the queen should previously, if it were possible, draw from them in conversation an avowal of the full extent of their powers. 2. That Murray's commissioners, as an inducement, should receive an assurance of impunity, if they could prove, to the satisfaction of the queen and her council, that Mary had been guilty of the murder of her husband. 3. That, to prevent the escape of the Scottish queen to the borders, she should be removed from Bolton to Tutbury ;[1] and lastly, that, on account of the importance of the investigation, the attendance of all the privy councillors should be required, and in addition, of the earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, Worcester, Sussex, and Huntingdon, so that the first estate of the English nobility might be consulted. Norfolk and Suffolk were accordingly recalled from York; Murray received permission to follow them to London; and a new commission was issued, comprising, in addition to the three former members, the lord keeper Bacon, the earls of Arundel and Leicester, the lord Clinton, and secretary Cecil.[2]

But this artful scheme, whatever might be its ulterior object, was defeated by the foresight of Mary. At first she seems to have cherished the most flattering expectations ; but when she learned that Murray had proceeded to London, and that, in violation of the royal promise,[3] he had been admitted into the presence of Elizabeth, her former disquietude revived; she saw the existence of a dark and mysterious plot Nov. 22.

[1] At this time Elizabeth told Shrewsbury that "er it were longe "he shuld well perseve that she dyd so trust hym, as she dyd few." His suspicion of her meaning was soon realized ; for on December 13 he writes, "now it is sarten the Scotes quene comes to Tutbury "to my charge."—Hunter's Hallamshire, 64.

[2] Goodall, ii. 179—182, 189. [3] Ibid. 184, 215.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

devised for her ruin; and she ordered her commissioners to require of the queen, in the presence of the nobility and foreign ambassadors, that she might be confronted with her accusers before them all; and, if so equitable a request were refused, to declare that their powers were withdrawn, and to demand their passports.[1] The sequel proved that her suspicions

Nov. 26.

were well founded. Murray received favourable answers to the questions which he had proposed at York, that, if he proved the charges against Mary, judgment should be pronounced; the Scottish queen should not be restored to authority, and all his acts should be allowed.[2] Thus encouraged, he brought forward his charge, that Mary had been "of fore-"knowledge, counsel, and device, persuader and com-"mander of the murder of her husband, and had "intended to cause the innocent prince to follow his "father, and so to transfer the crown from the right "line to a bloody murderer and a godless tyrant."

Dec. 1.

Mary's commissioners immediately requested an audience of the queen, and demanded that as Murray and his associates had been admitted into her presence to accuse their sovereign, she might also be admitted into the same presence to prove her innocence; and that in the mean time her accusers might be detained

Dec. 3.

in the country, to receive, at the close of the inquiry, that punishment which they would be found to

[1] "He being ressavit and welcomet unto hir, and we, an free "princess, not haveing access to answer for our selves, as he and "his complices, thinks, therefoir, ye can proceid na farther in this "conference; for ther may be some heids proponit quhairto you can "not answer of your selfis, unless we were there in proper persoun, "to give answer to the calumnies quhilk may come in question "aganis us, swa that partiality appeirs to be usit manifestly."—Goodall, ii. 185. Lettres de Marie, 229, 233.

[2] Goodall, ii. 200

deserve. Elizabeth coldly replied, that it was a subject which required long and mature deliberation.

It was in vain that the bishop of Ross and his colleagues made every effort to obtain an answer. They applied to the council; they petitioned the queen; they protested against the proceedings; and, by the advice of the duke of Chastelherault, and of the French and Spanish ambassadors, declared that the conference was at an end.[1] But Cecil would not allow Dec. 6. of this proceeding; he was anxious to procure in due form the proofs of the accusers before the interruption of the conference; and, in defiance of every remonstrance, refused to receive their protest and declaration. Murray employed the interval to lay before the Dec. 9. commissioners the letters, contracts, and sonnets which had been secretly exhibited at York, accompanied with the depositions of several witnesses, and with such other papers as he deemed confirmatory of the charge.[2] By Leicester, Cecil, Sadler, and Bacon, they were deemed satisfactory; the latter even went so far as to assert that, as long as the Scottish queen was suffered to live, there could be no security for the life of Elizabeth. But the interests of Mary were supported by

[1] Goodall, ii. 206, 226. Fénélon, the French ambassador, did not arrive before November 10. He blamed the advisers of Mary for consenting to the conferences at all. They had placed, he said, her reputation, her crown, perhaps her life, at the mercy of her enemies, and were bound to put an end to the proceedings immediately, par recusations, ou par autres moyens declinatoires.—Dépêches de Fénélon, i. 23.

[2] Cecil would not receive the protest of Mary's commissioners on the 6th, under pretence that it gave an incorrect statement of the queen's answer. Whilst they amended it, Murray presented the documents, and, when the protest was again presented, Cecil insisted on its bearing the date of the last, not of the first presentation. They, aware of his object, refused, and the document now appears with both dates.—See Goodall, ii. 226, 239.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568. Norfolk, Arundel, Sussex, and Clinton;[1] and the doctors of canon and civil law, to whom her several demands had been submitted, decided that her claim of being personally heard in her own defence was reasonable, and ought in justice to be granted.[2] At last it was resolved to proceed in the following manner. The six earls, not councillors, were called into the council-chamber, and a brief, probably a partial, statement was made to them, under the injunction of secrecy, of the proceedings in the conferences at York and Westminster. Then the papers already furnished by Murray were read in their hearing; and the supposed originals were laid on the table, accompanied, for the purpose of comparison, with autograph letters from Mary to the queen. What impression was made on the minds of these six noblemen, we know not. The investigation lasted two days; and in conclusion, instead of being called upon to pronounce an opinion on the authenticity of the documents, or the guilt of the accused, they were informed that the queen thought it "not unmeet" to return the following answer to the demands of Mary; that, as hitherto she could not, without the blemish of her honour, admit Mary into her presence, whilst she was charged only by common fame, so much less could she do it now, that such strong evidence of guilt had been produced against her. The earls, having dutifully expressed their approbation of this answer, were dismissed, and the next morning the queen, sending

Dec. 14.

Dec. 15.

Dec. 16.

[1] Memorias, vii. 330, and despatches at Simancas. Fénélon says, that the duke and the earl of Arundel, besides their defence of Mary at the conference, represented to Elizabeth, "qu'en laissant op-"primer cette princesse à ses subjects, elle preparoit contre elle ung "mauvais example aux siens" (p. 79).

[2] The case and answer may be seen in Fénélon, i. 51—54.

for Mary's commissioners, acquainted them with the resolution which she had taken, stating, at the same time, that, under the existing circumstances, it was incumbent on the Scottish queen to make her defence in writing or by deputy; otherwise, her silence would be taken for an acknowledgment of guilt.[1]

Such is the official account of the proceedings; but the record has descended to us in a very suspicious shape, altered and interlined by the hand of Cecil. It is plain that he had been disappointed in his views; and that the earls had betrayed some distrust of the proofs, or made some objection to the manner of proceeding.[2] The conferences were immediately suspended, and a new intrigue set on foot. As Mary was now aware that the publication or concealment of papers so prejudicial to her honour depended on the pleasure of the English queen, it was hoped that with this knowledge she might be induced to resign her crown, or at least to be content with the title of queen, while the authority should remain with the regent. Knollys received orders to suggest and urge Dec. 22. to her the adoption of this scheme, but as proceeding from himself, and without authority; and the commissioners were detained at London, that by the advice of pretended friends they might be drawn into the

[1] Ibid. 254—264. A letter containing the same answer was written by Elizabeth—or rather for her, by Cecil—to Mary, and may be seen in Anderson, iv. 183; Goodall, ii. 269; and Wright, i. 302. But Mary had taken her resolution before it was written; for her instructions to her commissioners are dated on December 19, the letter from Elizabeth on December 21.

[2] According to the Spanish ambassador, in a letter to Philip, they had displayed some spirit, and checked a little the violence with which Cecil sought the destruction of Mary: "Dichos señores "havian mostrado algun valor. y contrastado un poco la furia "terrible, con que el secretario Cecil queria perder aquella señora." —Despatch of January 1, 1569. MSS. at Simancas.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568. Dec. 19.

same sentiments. But the resolution of Mary disconcerted her adversaries. She had no sooner received the refusal to admit her into the royal presence, than she ordered her commissioners to declare to the queen and council that, "where Murray and his accomplices "had said that she knew, counselled, or commanded "the murder of her husband, they had falsely, traito-"rously, and wickedly lied, imputing unto her the "crime of which they themselves were the authors, "inventors, doers, and some of them the very exe-"cutioners;" that, where they alleged that she had intended to make her son follow his father, "the "natural love which a mother bears to her only bairn" was sufficient to prove their falsehood, their attempt to have slain him in the womb sufficient to show their hypocrisy; that she could not allow charges so calumnious to pass over in silence, but demanded that copies of the papers should be given to her commissioners, and the originals submitted to her own inspection; and pledged her word to name certain individuals among her accusers, and to convict them of the murder, provided she might have access to the presence of the queen, and a reasonable time to collect her witnesses and proofs.[1]

1569. Jan. 2.

This unexpected declaration perplexed Elizabeth and the secretary; but the Christmas holidays allowed them a respite of a fortnight; and they waited with impatience for the result of the negotiation at Bolton.[2]

[1] Goodall, ii. 274—293. Lettres de Marie, ii. 257, 262. Elizabeth was already informed that the persons whom she chiefly meant to accuse were Morton and Maitland.—Goodall, ii. 71. Mary, in her instructions to her commissioners, declares that she never wrote such letters to any living creature; that, if any such exist, they are feigned and forged by her accusers.—See, on the authenticity of the letters, note (K).

[2] On January 3, Cecil informs Norris that matters are at a

On the seventh of January the bishop of Ross solicited an audience of the queen. He had received a new order from his sovereign to demand copies of the documents, that she might answer them in every particular, and prove to the whole world that her accusers were "liars" as well as traitors. Elizabeth replied that she would take time to consider the demand, but thought it best for Mary to resign her crown, and lead a peaceful life in England. The bishop assured her that such advice could not be admitted; the queen had authorized him to declare that she would never consent to it upon any conditions which were or could be proposed; but was willing to extend her clemency towards her disobedient subjects, as far as might stand with her honour and the common weal of her kingdom. He was desired to confer with the lords of the council; but persisted in the same refusal.[1]

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569. Jan. 7.

The bold and triumphant tone now assumed by the Scottish queen appears to have alarmed her adversaries. It was resolved to put an end to the conferences. Murray and his associates were first licensed to depart, with a declaration that as nothing had been proved against them to impair their honour, so they

Jan. 10.

stand, "because, for the saving of her honour, motion is made on "her behalf, to make some appointment between her and her sub- "jects; nevertheless, outwardly she offereth to prove herself inno- "cent, so she may be permitted to come to the queen's presence, "and answer for herself, which is thought to be the more earnestly "required, because it is also thought assured it will be denied;"— what will be the end he cannot guess.—Cab. 157. It should be recollected, that Cecil's advertisements to ambassadors are not always to be credited; they merely show the manner in which he wishes transactions to be represented in foreign courts.

[1] Goodall, ii. 297, et seqq. Quant à la demission de ma couronne, je vous prie de ne me plus empescher; cor je suis resolvée et deliberée plus tost mourir, que de faire; et la derniere parole que je ferons en ma vie sera d'une royne d'Ecosse.—Ibid. 301.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569. — Jan. 13.

had shown no sufficient cause why Elizabeth "should "conceive or take any evil opinion against the queen "her good sister."[1] Ross and his colleagues were next called, and received an assurance that copies of the papers should be sent to Mary, whenever she would pledge herself to give them a satisfactory answer. They replied that such delay was unnecessary, as Mary had already given that pledge on two occasions, by writings under her own seal and signature; that, if her accusers were permitted to return to Scotland, the same indulgence ought to be extended to her; and that, if it were intended to detain her a captive in England, they took the present opportunity to protest in her name against the validity of any act which should be performed by her while she remained under restraint.[2]

During the conferences at York, Mary had maintained a decided superiority; it has been contended that in those at Westminster she yielded the advantage to her adversaries, by refusing to plead, unless it were in the presence of the queen. Her demand has been represented as the evasion of a guilty conscience, a

[1] Mary's register, apud Goodall, ii. 305. Yet in the instructions sent to Norris in the autumn following, Elizabeth is made to say that "the circumstances produced to argue her guilty were such "as we wished that she and her commissioners had been otherwise "advised than to have entered so boldly into the treaty thereof."—Raumer, iii. 165. A fair sample of the ease with which Cecil could give to falsehood the colouring of truth. He it was who had employed every artifice to draw them into that treaty; and who, when he found her determined to go through with it, broke off the conferences altogether.

[2] Goodall, ii. 285, 288, 298, 305—315. Ross says, that from the time that Mary accused Murray and his associates, they became "earnest suitors to have licence to return to Scotland without far-"ther triall, which was granted unto them, but upon what condi-"tions, colour, and devises, God and their own conscience can wit-'ness."—Anderson, iii. 33.

pitiful expedient to avoid a trial from which she could anticipate nothing but conviction. To me such reasoning appears inconclusive. The claim of Mary was reasonable and just; she was not placed on an equal footing with her accusers; while they were present to produce their proofs, she was confined at a distance of more than two hundred miles, when she had to refute them; and the refusal of her request would naturally suggest a suspicion that her English sister sought not the discovery of the truth, but the condemnation of her captive. The triumph of Murray was however of short duration, and the subsequent conduct of the Scottish queen shows that the threat of interrupting the conferences was held out only as an inducement to Elizabeth to grant her demand. On the very day on which she received the refusal, she wrote to her commissioners, that she could not suffer the slander of Murray to pass unnoticed, and ordered them to resume the conferences by denying the charge, as far as regarded herself, and retorting it upon her accusers. From that moment she resumed the ascendancy. In proportion as she urged the prosecution of the inquiry, Murray shrunk from it. Even Elizabeth condescended to solicit a compromise. But it was then too late. Mary would submit to no conditions till her innocence was established; and the last resource of her enemies was to send back the regent with his originals to Scotland, and to lock up the copies from the inspection of Mary and her commissioners. The victory was undoubtedly hers. It was claimed by her friends; and it appears to have been acknowledged by the chief of the English nobility, who had witnessed the whole of the proceedings.[1]

[1] Ross, apud Anderson, i. 80; iii. 58. When Cecil saw this

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

The duke of Norfolk, on his return from the conferences at York, had met with a very ungracious reception from Elizabeth. Aware of the cause, he assured her that the project of a marriage between himself and Mary had not originated from him; that he had never given, nor would ever give, to it any encouragement. "But would you not," said she, "marry the Scottish queen, if you knew that it would "tend to the tranquillity of the realm, and the safety "of my person?" "Madam," replied the duke, "that "woman shall never be my wife, who has been your "competitor, and whose husband cannot sleep in "security on his pillow." This sarcastic allusion, while it gratified the malice, lulled the suspicion of Elizabeth.[1] But Murray, before his departure, was careful to revive the former intrigue. He sent Robert Melville to Mary, and waited in person on the duke. To both he made the same observation; that the only expedient to secure the tranquillity of both realms, was the marriage of the Scottish queen with a Protestant nobleman, and that no nobleman was so likely to win the approbation of all parties as the duke of Norfolk. The duke replied, that he could not resolve a question of such importance till he had ascertained the will of his sovereign; Mary, that she would give no answer while she remained a captive. Let him restore her to her authority, she would then listen to

passage, he wrote to Norris: "In this book a notable lie is uttered, "that all the noblemen that heard her cause did judge her innocent, "and therefore made suite to her majesty, that she might marry "with my lord of Norfolk."—Cabala, 174. The last is not asserted by Ross; the first is, and that they wished her well to marry the duke. I suspect that the bishop is correct, from the conduct of Arundel, Pembroke, and Leicester.

[1] Haynes, 574. Murdin, 51, 180. Howell's State Trials, i. 988. Anderson, iii. 36, 41.

his advice, and prove herself a forgiving and indulgent sister. CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

There is reason to believe that Murray, on this occasion, acted with his accustomed duplicity. He was aware that the Scottish friends of Mary had assembled on the borders to oppose his return; and that the Nortons, Markenfields, and other northern families in England, had associated to intercept him on his road through Yorkshire. He had in reality no inclination to support a measure which would remove him from the regency; but he sought to elude the snares of his enemies; and, by this message, procured from the credulity of his sister an order to her friends to offer no violence to him during his journey.[1] Jan. 23.

The Scottish queen was already at Rippon, on her way to Tutbury; and from Tutbury, after a short stay, was removed to Wynfield, being all the time in the custody of the earl of Shrewsbury. The foreign powers complained of the confinement of a crowned head; but, in answer to their remonstrances, Elizabeth boasted of her indulgence to Mary, in putting an end to the investigation, and suppressing documents which would otherwise render her the execration of her contemporaries, and immortalize her infamy with posterity.[2] Feb. 2. April 22.

It was through his influence over the mind of Elizabeth that Cecil had been able to triumph over the Scottish queen; the same influence now gave him the victory over his enemies in the council. The duke of Norfolk and the earls of Arundel and Pembroke had long borne with impatience the authority which he assumed in the administration; but they dared not

[1] Murdin, 51, 54. State Trials, i. 982.
[2] Digges, 14. Raumer, iii. 169.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569. February.

oppose him openly, till they had brought over to their party the queen's favourite, the earl of Leicester; then they gave manifest indications of discontent by absenting themselves on frivolous pretexts from the meetings of the council; and, when Elizabeth inquired the reason, Leicester ventured to inform her that men generally disapproved of the policy of Cecil, who, by inducing her to support the rebellious subjects of other princes, led to the adoption of measures injurious to her reputation, dangerous to her crown, and prejudicial to the interests of the nation. The queen undertook his defence with warmth and obstinacy; but Cecil himself deemed it prudent to bend a while to the storm, and sought to disarm the hostility of his opponents by a show of deference to the opinion of his colleagues in the council, and by confining himself to his own department of secretary.[1]

Still, however, they indulged the hope of removing him from the government. They reckoned on the aid of the ancient nobility, by whom the elevation of Cecil and his friends was considered as the depression of themselves; of the Catholics, who looked upon him as their bitterest enemy; of the friends of Mary Stuart, by whom her long captivity was attributed to his counsels; and of the whole body of merchants, smarting under the loss of their goods seized at the depôts of Rouen and Antwerp by the kings of France and Spain, who had been provoked to this measure of retaliation by injuries inflicted with his license, or under his connivance. With such support they might in time have subdued the reluctance of the queen,

[1] Fénélon, i. 204, 233, 235, 258, 384, 414.

had they not struck on that fatal rock, the marriage of Mary with the duke of Norfolk. It was indeed an expedient which, in the estimation of many, offered the most promising remedy for the evils anticipated from the claim of the Scottish queen and her union with some foreign prince; but to Elizabeth herself it appeared little less than a traitorous attempt to deprive her of the crown. By the ambition of the duke it was secretly coveted; but he remembered his promise, and feared the resentment of his sovereign, when the subtle Throckmorton came to his aid, and persuaded Leicester to break the matter to the duke, as if it had originated with himself.[1] By Norfolk the suggestion was received with apparent dislike; he proposed, in his place, first Leicester himself, then his own brother, the lord Henry; and at last suffered

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569. — May.

[1] It has been supposed that Leicester was induced to act thus through the hope of marrying Elizabeth, if Norfolk were to marry Mary. But it was now more than twelve months since he had abandoned that project. We learn, however, from a secret despatch of Fénélon, that, soon after the breaking off of the match with the archduke Charles, Norfolk told Leicester as a friend, that, if matters were so far advanced between him and the queen, that he was sure of marrying her, he should own it, and behave in a proper and decent manner, in which case the duke would aid him to the best of his power; but, if it were otherwise, he should put an end to his great familiarity with her, and be content with the high offices which he held, without aspiring to the honour of the crown, or injuring the honour of his sovereign. "Et le taxa de ce qu'ayant "l'entrée, comme il a, dans la chambre de la royne, lorsqu'elle est "au lict, il s'estoit ingéré de luy bailler la chemise au lieu de sa "dame d'honneur, et de s'azarder de luy mesme de la bayser, sans y "estre convyé." Leicester thanked him for the offer of his support, and said that the queen had indeed given him so much encouragement that he had occasionally taken trifling liberties with her; but that he should in a short time know her final determination, and would then follow his advice. Soon afterwards the queen gave him a decided denial: from which "et d'aulcuns propos qu'elle "a tenuz touchant d'aultres grandz partis, et pour une forme de "vivre à quoy elle s'est adonnée, les grandz de ce royalme tiennent "pour chose résolue qu'elle ne prendra jamais mary."—Fénélon, ii. 120—122.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

his consent to be extorted from him. A meeting was subsequently held with the bishop of Ross, the agent of Mary, and Wood, the envoy of Murray; and a common letter was written to the Scottish queen in the names of Norfolk, Arundel, Pembroke, and Leicester. They proposed that she should be restored to her throne, and receive a confirmation of her claim to the succession in England, on the following conditions: that she should never impugn the right of Elizabeth, or of the heirs of her body; should conclude a perpetual league, offensive and defensive, with England; should allow the English reform to be established in Scotland; should receive her disobedient subjects to favour; should procure from the duke of Anjou a renunciation of all claims which she might have ceded to him; and, lastly, should consent to a marriage with the duke of Norfolk. On the first five points her answer was satisfactory; with respect to the last, she replied, that woeful experience had taught her to prefer a single life; but she was willing to sacrifice her own feelings to their superior judgment; one thing only she required, that they should previously obtain the consent of Elizabeth; for the displeasure of her English sister at her marriage with Darnley had been the origin of all her subsequent misfortunes.[1]

June 1.

[1] Camden, i. 186. Anderson, iii. 50—52. Haynes, 535, 542, 545. Wright, i. 326. It is worthy of remark, that Fénélon, in his despatches, divides the council and the nation into two great parties, "the Catholics" and "the Protestants." Under the name of "the Catholics," he constantly includes all the opponents of Cecil and his supporters "the Protestants," of which opponents, not only a great portion, but most of the leaders, Norfolk, Arundel, Pembroke, and others, were Protestants. These names therefore, with him designate, not religious, but political parties. He moreover attributes to "the Catholics" not only a constant opposition to the severe measures against the professsors of the old religion,

When the liberation of the Scottish queen was discussed in the English cabinet, the four lords proposed the five first articles; but they suppressed all notice of the marriage, till Maitland, who was to disclose the project to Elizabeth, should arrive from Scotland. The plan was approved; and the lords Boyd and Wood were despatched, the former to procure the consent of the Scottish royalists, the latter that of the regent and his party. Norfolk immediately opened a secret correspondence with Mary, through the agency of the bishop of Ross. He persuaded himself that the English queen was still ignorant of the whole proceeding; but the fidelity of Leicester is rather doubtful, and of Wood, it is certain that he had betrayed the secret before his departure.[1]

May 14.

The intrigue was now rapidly hastening to a crisis. Bothwell, by a formal instrument, had signified from Denmark his consent to a divorce, to be pronounced by any competent tribunal; Mary had accepted the proposal, and Norfolk had engaged himself to Mary so far, that, to use his own expression, he could not recede in conscience, though he would not advance a step further, till Murray had removed certain impediments out of his way.[2] The approbation of the

July 2.

advised by Cecil and his friends, but also a fixed design of restoring the ancient worship, excepting however the earl of Leicester, from whose knowledge it was withheld. Now, though this may be true of the real Catholics of the party, it cannot be true of Norfolk and other real Protestants. The case I take to be this. He came with orders to consult the bishop of Ross, and that wily agent found it convenient to give him such information, because it was through him that he hoped to obtain the requisite consent of the king and queen-mother of France, and of Mary's relations of the house of Guise, to the marriage of that princess with the Protestant duke of Norfolk. A few years later we shall find him employing again the same deception.

[1] Anderson, iii. 50—55. Hardwicke Papers, i. 189—194.

[2] Haynes, 520. The duke intrusted his secret to the French ambassador.—Fénélon, ii. 194. The exact terms of the contract

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

kings of France and Spain had been asked through their ambassadors, and certificates received that Mary had never ceded any of her rights to the duke of Anjou; Cecil, to whom the matter was opened by Norfolk himself, though he would not promote, engaged not to oppose the project; and the consent had been obtained of the principal nobility, though some expressed an apprehension that the duke would fall a victim to his credulity. Nothing remained but that the regent should approve the articles, and that Maitland should open the subject to Elizabeth. Much repugnance was anticipated on her part; but that, it was thought, might be subdued by the consentient efforts of her council and nobility.[1]

Murray assembled the Scottish parliament, and, while he affected to speak in favour of the liberation of Mary, employed all his influence to prevent it. July 25. The articles devised by the English council were rejected; even a motion to appoint judges, who might examine the validity of the queen's marriage with Bothwell, was negatived. Maitland saw the perfidy of the regent; as soon as his favourite plan was defeated, he began to fear for his own safety, and sought an asylum amongst the clansmen of his friend the earl of Athol.[2]

are unknown. It was subscribed by the duke, and sent by him to Mary with a jewel, as a pledge of his faith. "I took the diamant," she writes to him, "from my lord Boyd, which I shall keep unseen about my neck, till I give it agayn to the owner of it and me both."—Lettres de Marie, iii. 5. She continued to wear it eighteen years; for, when she received orders to prepare for her own execution in 1586, she sent it to Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador in Paris. "Vous recevrez," she writes, "un toquen de moi, d'un diamant, que j'avois cher, pour estre celui dont le feu duc de Norfolk m'obligea sa foi, et que *j'ai toujours porte quasi*. Gardez le pour l'amour de moi."—Ibid. vi. 460.

[1] Haynes, 549. Anderson, iii. 62, 63. Camden, i. 187.

[2] Anderson, iii. 71. Cabala, 155, 156. Fénélon, ii. 204. On

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569. August 13.

An envoy, with the narrative of the proceedings of the Scottish parliament, found Elizabeth at Farnham, and it was immediately whispered among the ladies at court that Mary and Norfolk were secretly contracted to each other.[1] Though Leicester was urged, though he promised to represent the whole matter to the queen, he delayed. Elizabeth invited the duke to dinner; and, as she rose from table, advised him to beware on what pillow he should rest his head. This ominous allusion alarmed him and his friends; Leicester again promised, and again delayed; and the court proceeded to Tichfield, where Elizabeth was informed that her favourite was confined to his bed by a sudden and dangerous indisposition. She hastened to visit him; and received from him, as she sat by his bedside, a confession, interrupted with sighs and tears, of his ingratitude and disloyalty, in having, without her knowledge, attempted to marry her rival to one of her subjects.[2]

Leicester was soon forgiven by the love-sick queen, and immediately recovered;[3] Norfolk was severely reprimanded, and forbidden on his allegiance ever more to entertain the project. He assented with an appearance of cheerfulness; but soon observed that, whenever he came into the royal presence, Elizabeth

this the duke remarked, "he (Murray) hathe a new marke in hys "eye, no less than a kyngdom; God send hyme suche luke as others "have hade, that hathe followyd his cowrse."—Haynes, 522.

[1] Murray informed the queen that the Scots would not consent to the restitution of Mary in any manner. Elizabeth was displeased, for she began to wish her out of the realm, upon conditions to avoid peril. Norfolk's marriage with her might succeed, if Elizabeth would approve, says Cecil, "but I wish myself as free "from the consideration thereof, as I have been from the intelli- "gence of the devising thereof."—Cabala, 169.

[2] Camden, i. 188. Haynes, 546.

[3] He was ill three days.—Fénélon, ii. 230. September 14.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569. met his eye with looks of disdain and anger, that the courtiers avoided his company, and that Leicester treated him in public as an enemy.[1] He retired from court; as did also the earls of Arundel and Pembroke. The duke had promised to return within a week. He proceeded to London, and from London to Kenninghall, in Norfolk; thence he wrote to the queen, attributing his absence to the fear of her displeasure, which had been kindled against him by the artful suggestions of his enemies, and a well-founded apprehension that, if he made any stay in London, he would be thrown into prison. This apology served only to confirm Elizabeth in her belief of his disloyalty. She sent to him a peremptory order to return without delay; the earl of Huntingdon was joined in commission with the earl of Shrewsbury, and Viscount Hereford instructed to attend on them with an armed force, for the more secure custody of the Scottish queen; her apartments and cabinets were searched, but without effect, for the discovery of her correspondence and in particular of a letter written to her by the earls of Leicester and Pembroke; and a determination was taken (so we are assured) to put her to death the moment that the duke should venture, as it was expected that he would, to draw the sword in her favour.[2]

Sept. 15. Sept. 24. Sept. 22. Sept. 25.

The friends of Mary afterwards charged that unfortunate nobleman with want of spirit on this occasion. They were persuaded that, if he had stayed a few days

[1] When the queen first spoke to Norfolk on this occasion, he begged to be excused till she had consulted the council; she answered, that on such a point elle n'avoit que faire de l'adviz de son conseil.—Id. ii. 236.

[2] Camden, 189. Haynes, 521, 523, 525. 527, 529, 532. Cabala, 168. Fénélon, ii. 246, 248, 252, 256, 259, 269—274, 278.

longer at Kenninghall, he would have been joined by all the ancient nobility of the realm; and that Elizabeth, alarmed at so powerful an association, would have consented to the release of her captive.[1] But, if Norfolk ever indulged such thoughts, he quickly abandoned them on the receipt of the royal message; and, whether it was through consciousness of innocence, or fear for his own safety or that of Mary, he resolved, in opposition to the advice of his friends, to obey. Unfortunately, in the mean time the Scottish regent Murray, having in vain tampered with Maitland,[2] whom he had imprisoned as one of the murderers of Darnley, to become the accuser of the duke, acted the traitor himself, sending the letters which he had received from him to the queen, with a protestation that the project of marriage had not originated with himself; nor would it ever have obtained his assent, had he not been influenced by motives of personal safety. The resentment of Elizabeth was now wound up to the highest pitch. She ordered the duke, who had reached Burnham, within three miles of the court, to be committed to the Tower; the earls of Leicester, Arundel, and Pembroke, to be excluded from her presence; and the bishop of Ross, the lord Lumley, Throckmorton, and a foreigner named Ridolphi,[3] to

Oct. 1.

Oct. 9.

[1] Murdin, 97, 126. Memorias, 343.

[2] Laing, ii. 295—318. "He has flatly denied to me to be in "any sort the accuser of the duke of Norfolk."—Murray to Cecil, apud Chalmers, ii. 483. On the day of trial his friends assembled in such numbers, that the regent put it off for an indeterminate period.—Laing, ii. 326.

[3] Ridolphi was an Italian merchant and banker, who had been settled in London for the last fifteen years; and was at the same time a secret agent for the pope and foreign powers.—Camden, 224. Fénélon, i. 259. After a month's imprisonment he was discharged, but paid a large sum for his liberty.—Id. ii. 351. Memorias, vii. 356.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

be placed under arrest. All were subjected to that rigorous system of examination which was then in use. A series of ensnaring questions was proposed to each individual in private, and at the same time he was told that his only hope of mercy depended on the veracity of his answers. The different confessions were then compared; the collation suggested new questions, to explain discrepancies, to call forth additional information, and to draw the prisoners into accusations of each other. Thus the interrogatories were multiplied, till the prosecutors had sifted every suspicious circumstance, and had convinced themselves either of the guilt or of the innocence of the accused. Of the examinations on this occasion, many are still extant;[1] and from them it is evident that the duke and his friends entertained no traitorous or disloyal intention; though their presumption, in treating with a foreign princess on such a subject, and in such circumstances, was calculated to offend the feelings and to defeat the policy of their sovereign.

But the attention of the ministers was soon occupied by a much more alarming project. Among the noblemen who in December had been called to Westminster, to inquire into the charges against Mary Stuart, were the two great northern earls, Percy of Northumberland, and Neville of Westmoreland, both

[1] Haynes, 534—536, 541, 549. When the commissioners informed her that Norfolk had done nothing for which the law would punish him, she replied, "If the law will not, my authority shall." Et entra en si grand collere, qu'elle esvanouyt, et courut l'on au vinaigre, et aultres remèdes pour la faire revenir.—Fénélon, 302. Cecil did not venture into her presence, but advised her by letter to say nothing of treason, but to examine into the facts only, for he could not see how the duke could be charged with treason. Oct. 6. Von Raumer, iii. 179. Yet Fénélon says that Cecil va aigrissant la matiere (p. 303).

of them Catholics, both declared friends of the Scottish queen. They availed themselves of the opportunity to confer with her known agents, Ridolphi, the bishop of Ross, and the Spanish ambassador.[1] With these men they entered into engagements, the nature of which will be disclosed by the subsequent events, and communicated, on their return home, their views and objects to the most trusty of their adherents, to the two uncles of Westmoreland, to Leonard Dacre, uncle of the late Lord Dacre, to Egremont Ratcliffe, a brother of the earl of Sussex, to the Nortons, Markenfields, Tempests, Swinburnes, and other gentlemen of wealth and influence in the northern counties. From all they received promises of co-operation; from some, as it appears, through mere attachment to the chiefs of the two houses of Percy and Neville; from the majority of Catholics who cherished a hope of their relieving themselves from persecution, and restoring the ancient worship;[2] and from numbers, men of generous and chivalrous feelings, who offered to risk their lives and fortunes for the deliverance from

[1] Compare Gonzales, Apuntamientos, p. 88, with Northumberland's confession in Sir Cuthbert Sharp's Rebellion of 1569, App. p. 189.

[2] Dr. Nicholas Morton, formerly a prebendary of York, had visited the northern counties in the spring of this year. He came from Rome with the title of apostolical penitentiary. The object of his mission appears to have been to impart to the Catholic priests, as from the pope, those faculties and that jurisdiction which they could no longer receive in the regular manner from their bishops. Camden says that he urged the northern gentlemen to rebellion, and had been sent to inform them that the pontiff had deposed the queen, on account of heresy (Camden, 194); but he could only inform them that a bull of deposition was in preparation; for it was not signed or published till the next year. Of his activity, however, in preparing the insurrection, there can be little doubt. The Nortons and Markenfields were his relatives. His father and Markenfield's father had married two sisters.—Strype, ii. 389.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

prison of a young and unfortunate queen. For several months the earls awaited with impatience the issue of the measures pursued by the lords at court, the friends of the duke of Norfolk. These measures, as the reader has seen already, successively failed. Cecil, in defiance of their efforts, was still lord of the ascendant, and the queen forbade the projected marriage in the most peremptory and menacing language.

These failures might disappoint, they did not intimidate the two earls. Percy informed the Spanish ambassador that "every preparation had been made "to take the Scottish queen out of prison by force, "and that he would keep her in his power, reckoning "upon the good pleasure of the court of Madrid."[1] The reply of Espés was cold and cautious. He could not advise the employment of force, it would infallibly lead to the immediate death of Mary;[2] nor had he authority to pledge his sovereign to aid them: for that they must apply to the duke of Alva in Flanders.[3] This answer was followed by the secret arrival of

Sept. 20.

[1] Gonzales, 94.

[2] Nor was he far wrong, for very soon afterwards "the council "dealt effectually for justice to be done upon Mary, for being sus- "pected and infamed to be consenting with Northumberland and "Westmoreland in the rebellion. The great seal of England was "sent then, and thought just and meet upon the sudden for her "execution." This appears certain from a letter written at a later period by the earl of Leicester, and published by Mr. Tytler (viii. p. 383). The execution did not follow; perhaps the order was immediately revoked, as sometimes happened through the queen's irresolution; perhaps it was only conditional, to be put in force if any attempt were made in favour of her escape.

[3] Espés was enthusiastic in the cause of Mary Stuart, and prodigal of promises to her partisans. He seems to have supposed that Alva felt as he did, and would act as he wished; and they gave full credit to his promises, and were encouraged by them to rise.—See in Fénélon, ii. 352, 422, the extravagant expectations which he had raised.

Havers, a messenger from the duke of Norfolk. Westmoreland met him at four in the morning in a field beyond the park at Brancepath, and learned from him that the duke was at that moment on his way to the court, in obedience to the queen's order, and that he conjured his friends in the north to abstain from any hostile demonstration, because the least movement on their part would cost him his life.[1] The rising was on this account postponed; but the frequent purchase of horses and armour at fairs and markets, and the continual resort of strangers and suspicious characters to Brancepath, could not fail to attract notice, and provoke inquiry.

The earl of Sussex, who was lord president of the north, received orders from court to summon all the members of his council to York, that they might take into consideration the unsettled state of the country. Percy and Neville attended, took their places at the board according to their rank; displayed in their advice and language a loyalty which no one ventured to call in question; and returned home armed with new powers to put down illegal and dangerous assemblies. It had been intended to arrest them in the council, if any plausible pretext had been offered; they probably owed their escape to the credulity of Sussex, who, looking on them as his associates in favour of the duke of Norfolk, gave them credit for the same loyalty to Elizabeth which he felt himself. But the cabinet at Westminster was better informed, and the earls received a second order, delivered to them in the queen's name, to present themselves without fail

Oct. 8.

[1] Murdin, 97, 126. Memorias, 343. Sharp, App. 196, compared with p. 362, note. The countess of Westmoreland was the sister of Norfolk.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

before the council in York. Their eyes were instantly opened to the danger which threatened them. Westmoreland replied that he dared not obey at that moment, on account of the number of armed men to be met with on the roads. Northumberland began to waver. He was lying at his house at Topcliffe, no great distance from York; and his servants, to put an end to his irresolution, roused him from his bed in the dark of the night with a false report that an armed force was at hand to take him into custody. He fled to Brancepath, whence he wrote to the lord president, excusing his delay on account of his alarm and flight, and promising to obey the queen's order, but without mentioning any time for his appearance. Both letters were accordingly taken for refusals.[1]

Nothing now remained for the two earls but to unsheathe the sword. Nor did they shrink from the contest. They wrote immediately to the pope (Pius V.), stating their devoted attachment to the Catholic creed, soliciting from him an immediate supply of money, and praying him to employ his influence with the court of Madrid to procure for them military aid from the Spanish army in the Netherlands.[2] Westmoreland despatched messages to his friends in every part of the bishopric, and the roads were soon covered with small parties of armed horsemen riding towards Brancepath, where they were hastily mustered and trained in the park. But symptoms of dissension soon appeared among the leaders. Northumberland, whose resolution was generally suspected, declared that he could not think of unfurling the Percy banner in the battle-field with only six followers, the number

Nov. 8.

[1] Camden's Elizabeth, i. 192. Sharp, 12, 13. App. p. 292, 293.
[2] Ep. Pii V. edit. Gobau, p. 290.

that accompanied him to Brancepath; he would therefore repair to Alnwick, raise the county, and watch at the same time the Scottish rebels on the borders, and the English garrison at Berwick. To this the gentlemen of the bishopric offered the most obstinate resistance. The earls should never "sundre." Separation would be the ruin of the cause, and of all who had embarked in it. They would fight and conquer, but it must be under the united banners of the Percies and Nevilles.

Nov. 13.

That evening nothing was concluded; early in the morning Northumberland departed. He had not proceeded a mile before he was overtaken by a body of armed men from Brancepath, who surrounded him and compelled him to return. The dispute was resumed, but suddenly terminated by the arrival of a pursuyvant from the lord president, with an order from the queen in her own hand, commanding both the earls, "on "their allegiance, to make their repair forthwith to "the court." The duke of Norfolk had obeyed a similar order and been sent to the Tower. Westmoreland declared that he would never deliver himself up in this manner to imprisonment and the scaffold. It were better to die in the field. Northumberland could resist no longer. He exclaimed that he would share the fortune of his brother earl. Dissension was now at an end; with shouts of joy the banner of insurrection was raised; and the bells of the parish churches spread the information throughout the country.[1]

Nov. 14.

[1] Sharp, App. p. 199, 200. It appears that the leaders, before the insurrection, assembled several clergymen, and put to them the question, whether the unjust arrest and imprisonment of the duke of Norfolk would not justify them in taking up arms in defence of their

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

The first object of the insurgents was to march to Tutbury, to liberate the queen of Scots, and to extort from Elizabeth a declaration that Mary was next heir to the throne. But to have avowed this, would have been to provoke the removal, if not the death of Mary. It was therefore passed over in silence; and, in the numerous proclamations which they published, they state that, if they have taken up arms, it is for the honour and safety of the queen, of the nobility, and of the kingdom. Her majesty is surrounded "by "divers newe set-upp nobles, who not onlie go aboute "to overthrow and put downe the ancient nobilitie of "the realme, but also have misused the quene's ma-"jestie's owne personne, and also have by the space "of twelve yeares nowe past set upp and mayntayned "a new-found religion and heresy contrary to God's "word." Wherefore they call on all true Englishmen to join with them in their attempt to restore the crown, the nobility, and the worship of God, to their former estate.[1]

Aware how powerfully, in times of public commotion, the minds of men are swayed by their religious partialities and antipathies, the insurgents expected much from their repeated appeals to the religious feelings of the people. "There are not," says

liberties, and of the ancient nobility of the realms. The opinions were divided, but most answered in the negative.—Murdin, 221; and Northumberland's confession. It is said that a few days before the insurrection, Northumberland and his countess went to Wentworth House. The latter sought to introduce herself in disguise as a nurse to Bastian's wife in childbed. Had she succeeded, she meant to exchange clothes with Mary, that the latter might escape. —So Chalmers, from a letter in the Paper Office, i. 345.

[1] The earls did not adhere to the same form in their proclamations. Some were issued in the name of one, some in the names of both; but all reminded their readers of the destruction of religion, and the depression of the nobility.

Sadler, "in all this country ten gentlemen that do "favour and allow of her majesty's proceedings in the "cause of religion."[1] Occasionally, indeed, some of them attended the established worship, that they might escape the grievous penalties threatened by the law; but this very conformity, extorted in opposition to conscience, exasperated their discontent. They saw around them examples of successful insurrection in the cause of religious liberty. The Calvinists of Scotland had established their own creed, in defiance of all opposition; the Calvinists of France had thrice waged war against their own sovereign; both had been aided with men and money by the queen of England. If this were lawful to other religionists, why might not they also draw the sword, and claim the rights of conscience?

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

The first act of hostility was the occupation of the city of Durham by the two earls, at the head of a body of armed horsemen. The inhabitants, either through fear or friendship, lent a willing ear to their demand of assistance; and mass was celebrated in the cathedral before several thousand people, the communion-table thrown down, and the English bible torn into pieces. Thence they marched forward, issuing proclamations, calling on the people for aid, and restoring the ancient service at Staindrop, Darlington, Richmond, and Rippon. Their standard, representing the Saviour, with blood streaming from his wounds, was borne by Richard Norton, an aged gentleman, whose grey locks and enthusiastic air aroused the feelings and commanded the respect of the beholders. They proceeded as far as Branham Moor without opposition, for the earl of Sussex dared

Nov. 14.

Nov. 15.

[1] Sadler, ii. 55.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

not meet them from York, nor Sir George Bowes to follow them from Barnard Castle. There they mustered their forces, amounting to seventeen hundred horse, well appointed, and something less than four thousand foot, part of them without arms. But here dissension insinuated itself into their counsels. Their money was already expended, and all their expectations had been disappointed. The duke of Alva waited for orders from Philip;[1] the Catholic gentlemen, instead of responding to their appeal, shunned their approach, and in most instances hastened to the royal banner, under the earl of Sussex;[2] and eight hundred horse, whom they had despatched to carry off the queen of Scots, returned from Pontefract with the intelligence that it was now too late, for precautions had been taken to prevent a surprise. In addition, alarming rumours were afloat of the numerous army collected in the south, under the earl of Warwick and the lord admiral; and they knew that the lord Hunsdon, with a force from the garrison of Berwick and the royalists on the borders, was preparing to assail them from the north. Under these circumstances they resolved to retrace their steps, and the

Nov. 22. main body returned to the earl of Westmoreland's castle of Raby.[3]

Their first care after their return was to despatch

Nov. 27. messengers into different counties, to solicit aid from the noblemen and gentlemen distinguished by their

[1] Fénélon, ii. 423.

[2] "I fynde the gentilmen of this countrey, though the most "parte of them be well affected to the cause which the rebells make "the colour of their rebellion, yet in outwarde shew well affected to "sarve your majestie trewly against them."—Sadler, November 26. Vol. ii. 43.

[3] Fénélon, ii. 377, and his secret memoir to the queen-mother, 417.

attachment to the ancient faith, or known to abet the cause of the queen of Scots. In their new manifesto they no longer talked of the reformation of religion, but of the necessity of determining the succession to the crown. This, they observed, had been the object of the ancient nobility of the realm; but had been defeated by the pernicious counsels of the queen's confidential advisers, who sought to maintain their own power by taking the lives and liberties of their adversaries. Hence they had determined to oppose force to force, and, committing themselves to the mercy of the Almighty, earnestly solicited the assistance of all who regarded the welfare of the realm, or the preservation of the ancient nobility. But their late retreat had revealed the secret of their weakness, and proved a useful warning to such of their friends as were not yet implicated in the rebellion. The earl of Derby was the first to apprehend the messenger and send his letters to the queen; the example was followed by many others; and Elizabeth, affected by the loyalty of their conduct, returned thanks to God, who had given her such loving and dutiful subjects,[1] though there is reason to believe that this loyalty in many was suggested more by regard for their personal safety than by attachment to her whom they owned for their sovereign.[2]

Nov. 29.

[1] Haynes, 563—565. Murdin, 38. Camden, 194. Sadler, ii. 54. "The queen's majesty hath had a notable tryal of her whole "realm and subjects in this time, wherein she hath had service "readily of all sorts, without respect of religion."—Cecil to Norris, Cabala, 180. It should, however, be observed, that his despatches to ambassadors are to be read with caution. They contain the statements which, whether true or false, that wily minister wished to be circulated in foreign courts.

[2] This was probably the case with Lord Derby, for we still find him, after the suppression of the rebellion, considered as a stanch friend by the partisans of Mary.—Murdin, 99, 103. Sussex says,

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.

On the first news of the insurrection, the queen had recourse to the most energetic measures. Arrests were ordered; the despatches of the French and Spanish ambassadors were intercepted and examined; a regiment of disciplined troops was called from the Isle of Wight to guard the royal person; the earl of Bedford was sent to keep in obedience the people of Wales; commissions were issued for the raising of men to form the southern army, and, as Cecil either was, or pretended to be, seriously indisposed, Elizabeth refused the prayer of Leicester that he might go to oppose the rebels, and detained him near herself as her principal adviser.[1] To her great disappointment, for more than a month the earl of Sussex, her lieutenant, had remained stationary at York. By many it was said that he maintained a secret correspondence with the two earls; and Elizabeth herself began to entertain suspicions of his loyalty. Sir Ralph Sadler proceeded to that city with the title of treasurer of the army, but to act as a spy on the conduct of the lieutenant; and a Captain Styrley was suborned to introduce himself as a friend to the earl of Westmoreland at Brancepath. Sussex, however, proved a loyal but cautious commander. The principal portion of his army consisted of Catholic gentlemen and their tenants, whom he dared not trust, though duty or interest had ranged them under the royal standard; the insurgents greatly outnumbered him in cavalry,

Nov. 18.

in a letter to Cecil (December 6), "I wyshe that some matter were "delyvered from thens wherby the realme myght understand my "lord of Norfolke, my lord of Arundell, and my lord of Pembroke, "did detest their doyngs; for that they abuse the pepell gretely in "the places nere to them with those delusions, and yesterdaye have "raysed a brute that th' erle of Worcester is raysing of pepell in "Wales, and my lord of Arundell in other places."

[1] Fénélon, ii. 367, 368.

and without additional force, he hesitated to venture a battle, the loss of which might be followed by the rising of the whole country.[1] His inactivity permitted the earls to besiege Sir George Bowes, the commander of the royalists, in Barnard Castle, which surrendered at the end of ten days;[2] and to occupy the small port of Hartlepool, under the delusive notion of opening a communication with the duke of Alva in the Netherlands; but on the approach of the earl of Warwick, who led an army of twelve thousand men, raised in the southern counties, Sussex set forward, keeping a day's march in advance, and hastened towards the insurgents, whose force was daily diminished by desertion, and whose hopes of success had been disappointed by the apparent apathy of the Catholics, and the absence of the expected aid from the Spanish forces. On the approach of the royal army, a council was held at Durham. The earl of Northumberland stated that he had not taken up arms against the queen, but to secure his person from arrest, and to offer his remonstrances against the evil counsels of some favourite ministers; the earl of Westmoreland combated the opinions of his associate; and the result of this dissension was the total dispersion of their force, and the abandonment of the enterprise. The footmen withdrew to their respective

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569.
Dec. 1.
Dec. 10.
Dec. 16.

[1] Sadler, ii. 42, 73, 78. Haynes, 553, 558, 569. I suspect, that the spy, Captain Styrley, was the same person as is called, Captain Shurley in Norton's speech at his execution. If so, he appears to have been an active agent in plotting the rebellion. Norton declared that "he was the cause of his death."—Howell's State Trials, i. 1085.

[2] His men mutinied, "so far as in one day and nyght 226 men "leapyd over the walls, and opened the gates, and went to the "enemy, of which nomber 35 broke their necks, legges, or armes in "the leaping."—Bowes to Cecil, Sharp, 100.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1569. homes; the earls, with five hundred horse, rode to Hexham; thence they repaired in the company of Edward Dacre to Naworth Castle; and from Naworth with two hundred men crossed the borders into Lid-
Dec. 21. disdale, and thence into Tiviotdale, escorted by three hundred Scottish horse, the partisans of Mary.[1]

It was in vain that Elizabeth demanded the immediate surrender of the fugitives. Murray, by
Dec. 24. threats and money, prevailed on Hector Armstrong, of Harlow, to give up the earl of Northumberland; yet he did not dare to send the captive to England, but confined him in the castle of Lochlevin. The
Dec. 30. countess, with the earl of Westmoreland, Ratcliffe, Norton, Markenfield, Swinburn, Tempest, and the other exiles, were safe under the protection of the border clans of Hume, Scot, Carr, Maxwell, and Johnstone, whose chiefs set at defiance the authority of the regent and the threats of Elizabeth.[2] In England the work of vengeance immediately began.

[1] Sadler, ii. 63, 64. Cabala, 170, 171. Fénélon, ii. 427. The men of Liddisdale stole the horses of the countess of Northumberland, of her two ladies, and of ten other persons, so that "they "were all left on foot at John of the Sydes house, a cottage not to "be compared with any dogge kennel in England."—Sharp, 115.

[2] Cabala, 171. Haynes, 373. Lodge, ii. 28. Sadler, ii. 50, 101. A letter from Constable, a spy, gives an interesting account of the borderers. "At supper I hard vox populi that the lord "regent would not for his owne honor, nor for th'onor of his "countrey deliver th'earls, if he had them both, unless it were to "have there quene delivered to him, and if he would agree to "make that change, the borderers would stirt up in his contrary, "and rescue both the quene and the lords from him, for the like "shame was never done in Scotland; and that he durst better eate "his own luggs than come again to sake Farniherst. Hector of "Th'arlow's (he had betrayed Northumberland) head was wished to "be eaten among us at supper."—Sadler, ii. 118. If we believe Ross, Murray had actually made the offer of exchange by two successive messengers; but Ross, with the foreign ambassadors, prevented it by their remonstrances.—Anderson, iii. 83, 84.

Those among the insurgents who possessed lands or chattels were reserved for trial in the courts of law, that their forfeitures might furnish the queen with an indemnification for the expenses of the campaign, and a fund of remuneration for the services of her adherents;[1] but the meaner classes were abandoned to the execution of martial law at the discretion of Sussex, who, whether it was through the natural severity of his disposition, or his anxiety to convince the queen of his loyalty, exercised his authority without mercy.[2] In the county of Durham alone more than three hundred individuals suffered death, nor was there between Newcastle and Wetherby, a district of sixty miles in length, and forty in breadth, a town or village in which some of the inhabitants did not expire on the gibbet as a warning to their fellows. The survivors were at length pardoned, but on condition that they should take not only the oath of allegiance, but also that of supremacy.[3]

[1] The number of these together with the fugitives amounted to fifty-seven, either noblemen or gentlemen or freeholders, whose names may be seen in the act of attainder.—Stat. of Realm, v. 549.

[2] To discover the guilty, Cecil had advised that a few inhabitants of each township should be apprehended, and compelled by imprisonment, and, "if nede shuld, by lac of foode," to disclose the names of those among their neighbours who had joined the rebels.—Sharp, 126.

[3] Camd. 197. Stowe, 644. Holin. iv. 237. Of his intended victims Sussex writes to Cecil on December 28, "the number "wherof is yet uncerten, for that I knowe not the number of the "townes; but I gesse that it will not be under 6 or 7 hundred at "the least that shal be exequuted of the comon sorte, besides the "prisoners taken in the felde."—Sharp, Memorials, 121. In his list for the county of Durham, dated January 4, he orders eighty to be hanged at Durham, forty-one at Darlington, twenty at Barnard Castle, and one hundred and seventy-two in the other towns and villages of the county.—Ibid. p. 133. Sir George Bowes, the marshal, states that he executed none who had not been in rebellion two days after the expiration of the first pardon, or had not been active in exciting their neighbours.—Ibid. All the documents

CHAP. III. A.D. 1570.

When the queen's lieutenant had taken ample vengeance on the rebels, she was advised to publish a proclamation declaratory of her past proceedings and present intentions. In it she observed, that many had been drawn into rebellion by false assertions of designing men, who attributed to her an intention of persecuting for religious opinions. She therefore declared, that she claimed no other ecclesiastical authority than had been due to her predecessors; that she pretended no right to define articles of faith, to change ancient ceremonies, formerly adopted by the Catholic and Apostolic church, or to minister the word or the sacraments of God; but that she conceived it her duty to take care that all estates under her rule should live in the faith and obedience of the Christian religion, to see all laws, ordained for that end, duly observed, and to provide that the church be governed and taught by archbishops, bishops, and ministers. Moreover, to do away all doubts arising from false reports, she assured her people that she meant not to molest them for religious opinions, provided they did not gainsay the Scriptures, or the creed Apostolic and Catholic, nor for matters of religious ceremony, as long as they should outwardly conform to the laws of the realm, which enforced the frequentation of divine service in the ordinary churches.[1]

No one had been more deeply implicated in the project for the liberation of Mary than Leonard Dacre, the male representative of the noble family of the

relating to these transactions have been collected and illustrated with much industry and research in the "Memorials of the Rebellion," by Sir Cuthbert Sharp, to whose kindness I am indebted for many of the foregoing particulars.

[1] Haynes, 501.

Dacres of Gillsland. At the commencement of the rebellion he left the court to raise men, avowedly for the service of Elizabeth, but with the intention of joining the two earls. Their disorderly flight from Hexham to Naworth convinced him that the cause was desperate. He hung upon their rear, made a number of prisoners, and obtained among his neighbours the praise of distinguished loyalty.[1] But the council was better acquainted with his real character; and the earl of Sussex received orders to apprehend him secretly, on a charge of high treason. With this view the lord Scrope, warden of the west marches, invited Dacre to Carlisle to a consultation respecting the state of the country. It was too stale an artifice to succeed. Dacre replied, that he was confined to his room by illness; but, if Scrope and his colleagues would take a dinner at Naworth, they should have his company, and the best advice which his poor head could devise.[2] Aware of his danger, he determined to brave single-handed the authority of his sovereign; and at his call, three thousand English and Scottish borderers ranged themselves under the scollop shells, the well-known banner of the Dacres. From Naworth Castle he sent a defiance to the lord Hunsdon, the commander of the royal army, who declined the combat, that he might join the force under lord Scrope at Carlisle. Leonard followed him four miles to the banks of the Chelt, where "hys footmen," says lord Hunsdon, "gave the prowdyst charge upon my "shott that I ever saw." But the wild valour of the borderers was no match for the steady discipline of a regular force. They were discomfited, and left to

CHAP. III. A.D. 1570. Jan. 18. Jan. 30. Feb. 20.

[1] Cabala, 171. Sadler, ii. 114.
[2] Sharp, App. p. 217.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1570.

their opponents a complete but not a bloodless victory. Leonard found an asylum first in Scotland, and afterwards in Flanders.[1]

It is probable that the hopes of Dacre were excited by the intelligence received from Scotland. Murray, the regent, had been shot in the street of Linlithgow by Hamilton of Bothwell-haugh.[2] It was said that revenge for injury suffered by his wife directed the aim of the assassin; it is plain that his design was known and approved by his political associates; for that very night the lairds of Ferniherst and Buccleuch crossed the borders in hostile array; the duke of Chastelherault and the earls of Argyle and Huntley immediately assumed the government in the name of Mary, and Kirkaldy, the governor of Edinburgh Castle, admitted them into the capital. The queen's lords and the king's lords, as the opposite parties were called, assembled in different places; the former summoned a parliament against the third of August for the purpose of choosing a regent; the latter sent a messenger to ask the advice and aid of Elizabeth. But the ascendancy assumed by Mary's lieutenant soon expired. The defeat of Dacre allowed the English queen to attend to the affairs of Scotland, and under the pretence of punishing those who had invaded her dominions, and offered an asylum to her rebels, she ordered the lord Scrope to enter Scotland on the western, the earl of Sussex on the eastern coast.

Jan. 23.

April 18.

Sadler, ii. 140. Camden, i. 197.

[2] Murray has been described, by the writers of one party, as an honest and patriotic nobleman, by those of the other, as one of the most selfish, designing, and unprincipled of men. I will merely remark as something extraordinary, that almost every charge made against him by the advocates of Mary is confirmed by the contemporary memoir of Bothwell, though of the existence of that memoir they must have been ignorant.

The clans of the Johnstones, Carrs, and Scots saw their lands wasted, their houses and fortresses given to the flames; Humecastle and Falscastle, the property of the lord Hume, were taken and garrisoned with Englishmen; and the earl of Morton, the chief among the king's lords, aided by his foreign allies, ravaged without mercy the domains of the Hamiltons, the Livingstones, and the other adherents of the captive queen.[1] They were saved from utter ruin by the importunities of the French ambassador and of the bishop of Ross. Elizabeth recalled her forces; June 24. she even appeared to waver between the choice of a successor to Murray and the liberation of Mary; but the escape of the English rebels from Scotland to Flanders[2] rekindled her resentment; she signified her willingness, that Morton and his friends should select a regent; and Lennox, the grandfather of the young king, was, at her recommendation, raised to that July 10. dignity.[3]

In narrating these events, the consequences of the detention of Mary in England, I have omitted several

[1] The countess of Westmoreland, though deeply implicated in the rebellion, did not follow her lord into Scotland, but repaired to Howard House, and after some hesitation, was received at court.—See her letter to Cecil in Sharp, App. p. 307; Wright, i. 358; and Memorias, 348.

[2] Whilst they remained in Scotland, they fought with the Scots against the English forces, and made several inroads into England. Applications for pecuniary assistance had been made in their favour, through a brother of Rudolphi, both to the pope and the king of Spain, but at too late a period. Pius sent them on the 20th of February twelve thousand crowns, about three thousand five hundred pounds English (Pii Quinti Ep. p. 293); the distribution of which may be seen in Murdin, 24, 42, 49, 125. Philip also sent Quempe with money and orders to the duke of Alva to assist them; but the duke thought that it was then too late.—Compare Memorias, vii. 346, with document xi. p. 423.

[3] Cabala, 171, 174—178. Lodge, ii. 42. Anderson, iii. 90—96. Holins. iv. 338. Memorias, 351.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1571.

isolated occurrences, to which it will now be necessary to call the attention of the reader.—1. When Pius IV. ascended the papal throne, he had sought by letters and messengers to recall Elizabeth to the communion of the Roman church; and afterwards he invited her, like other princes, to send ambassadors to the council at Trent.[1] The attempt was fruitless; but, though her obstinacy might provoke, his prudence taught him to suppress, his resentment. To the more fervid zeal of his successor, Pius V., such caution appeared a dereliction of duty. Elizabeth had by her conduct proclaimed herself the determined adversary of the Catholic cause in every part of Europe; she had supported rebels against the Catholic sovereigns in the neighbouring kingdoms; and had, in defiance of justice and decency, thrown into prison the fugitive queen of Scots, the last hope of the British Catholics. The pontiff considered himself bound to seek the deliverance of the captive princess; he represented to the kings of France and Spain that honour, and interest, and religion called on them to rescue Mary from imprisonment and death; and the moment he knew that Elizabeth had committed the cognizance of her cause to the commissioners at York and Westminster, he ordered the auditor Riario to commence proceedings against the English queen in the papal court. In the act of accusation it was asserted that

1550. May 5.

[1] Parpalia, whom she knew, was the first messenger (Camden, 72); the second, with the invitation, was Martinengo. He solicited a passport, through the Spanish ambassador. On May 1, 1560, a council was held, and the passport was refused, for these reasons: The opening of the council had not been notified to Elizabeth: it was not a free Christian council: her predecessors had always refused access to papal messengers, when they thought proper. She would refuse now, because his presence might cause disturbance in the realm.—Pallavicino, ii. 620. Camden, 84. Strype, i. 113.

Elizabeth had assumed the title of head of the church, deposed and imprisoned the canonical bishops, and instituted schismatical prelates in their sees; that, rejecting the ancient worship, she had supported a new worship, and received the sacrament after the manner of heretics; and that she had chosen known heretics for the lords of her council, and had imposed an oath derogatory from the rights of the Holy See. In proof of these charges were taken the depositions of twelve Englishmen, exiles for their religion,[1] and, after several months, the judges pronounced their opinion that she had incurred the canonical penalties of heresy. A bull was prepared, in which the pope, after the enumeration of these offences, was made to pronounce her guilty of heresy, to deprive her of her "pretended" right to the crown of England, and to absolve her English subjects from their allegiance. Still, forcible objections were urged against the proceeding, and Pius himself hesitated to confirm it with his signature. At length the intelligence arrived of the failure of the insurrection; it was followed by an account of the severe punishment inflicted on the northern Catholics, of whom no fewer than eight hundred were said to have perished by the hands of the executioners; and the pontiff, on the 25th of February, signed the bull, and ordered its publication. Several copies were sent to the duke of Alva, with a request that he would make them known in the seaports of the Netherlands; and by the duke some of these were forwarded to the Spanish ambassador in

CHAP. III. A.D. 1560. — 1570.

[1] The witnesses were Goldwell, the deprived bishop of St. Asaph; Shelley, prior of St. John's; Clennock, bishop elect of Bangor; Morton, prebendary of York; Henshaw, rector of Lincoln college; Daniel, dean of Hereford; Bromborough, Hall, and Kirton, doctors of divinity, and three others.—Becchetti, xii. 105.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1570. England.[1] Early in the morning of the fifteenth of May, one was seen affixed to the gates of the bishop of London's residence in the capital. The council was surprised and irritated; a rigorous search was made through the inns of law; and another copy of the bull was found in the chamber of a student of Lincoln's Inn, who acknowledged, on the rack, that he had received it from a person of the name of Felton. Felton resided near Southwark, a gentleman of large property and considerable acquirements; but his temper was ungovernable, and his attachment to the creed of his fathers approached to enthusiasm. On his apprehension he boldly confessed that he had set up the bull; refused, even under torture, to disclose the names of his accomplices and abettors; and suffered the death of a traitor, glorying in the deed, and proclaiming himself a martyr to the papal supremacy. But, though he gave the queen on the scaffold no other title than that of the pretender, he asked her pardon, if he had injured her; and in token that he bore her no malice, sent to her as a present, by the earl of Sussex, a diamond ring, which he drew from his finger, of the value of four hundred pounds.[2]

August 8.

If the pontiff promised himself any particular benefit from this measure, the result must have dis-

[1] Ibid. 107. It has been supposed that this bull was solicited by Philip; but, in a letter to his ambassador in England (June 30), he says that he never heard of its existence before it had been announced to him by that minister, and attributes it to the zeal rather than the prudence of the pontiff.—Memorias, 551.

[2] Camden, 211—215. Bridgewater, 42. Dodd, ii. 157. The government account of his execution makes him repent of the fact. It is in Howell's State Trials, 1085. His wife, who had been maid of honour to Mary, and a friend of Elizabeth, had till her death a license to keep a priest for her own family. Felton obtained the copies of the bull from the chaplain of the Spanish ambassador, who immediately left the kingdom.—Becchetti, 107.

appointed his expectations. The time was gone by when the thunders of the Vatican could shake the thrones of princes. By foreign powers the bull was suffered to sleep in silence; among the English Catholics, it served only to breed doubts, dissension, and dismay. Many contended that it had been issued by an incompetent authority; others that it could not bind the natives, till it should be carried into actual execution by some foreign power; all agreed that it was in their regard an imprudent and cruel expedient, which rendered them liable to the suspicion of disloyalty, and afforded their enemies a pretence to brand them with the name of traitors. To Elizabeth, however, though she affected to ridicule the sentence, it proved a source of considerable uneasiness and alarm. She persuaded herself that it was connected with some plan of foreign invasion and domestic treason.[1] She complained of it by her ambassadors as an insult to the majesty of sovereigns; and she requested the emperor Maximilian to procure its revocation. To the solicitations of that prince Pius answered by

A.D. 1570.

1571. Jan. 5.

[1] A conspiracy was detected in Norfolk, about the same time when Felton set up the bull; but there does not appear any connection between the two. Three gentlemen were accused of a design to invite Leicester, Cecil, and Bacon to dinner, to seize them as hostages for the duke of Norfolk, who was still in the Tower, and to expel the foreign Protestants, who had lately been settled in the county. They had a proclamation ready, inveighing against the wantonness of the court, and the influence of new men.—Camden, 215. Lodge, ii. 46. Soon afterwards Lord Morley retired to the continent. It was supposed that he scrupled to acknowledge the queen after the publication of the bull, and the earl of Southampton requested to have on the subject the opinion of the bishop of Ross, who replied, that there could be no difficulty; such bulls must, before they could bind, be put in execution, and that depended on foreign princes, not on private individuals.—Murdin, 30, 40. It appears, however, that Morley left the kingdom on another account; to escape the prosecutions with which he was threatened for having been present at mass.—Haynes, 604, 605, 622.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1571.

asking, whether Elizabeth deemed the sentence valid or invalid. If valid, why did she not seek a reconciliation with the Holy See? if invalid, why did she wish it to be revoked? As for the threat of personal revenge, which she held out, he despised it. He had done his duty, and was ready to shed his blood in the cause.[1]

2. If, however, the kings of France and Spain refused to avail themselves of the papal bull, it was not because they had received no cause of provocation. The English ministers persisted in their former policy. That they might occupy these powerful princes at home, they continually urged the reformers in France and the Netherlands to take up arms, and aided their efforts sometimes covertly with money, sometimes more openly by actual hostilities. The discontent in the Netherlands was at first common to both Catholics and Protestants. The natives had for centuries grown in wealth and population under the mild and paternal government of the dukes of Burgundy; but the rights and franchises which they claimed accorded not with the arbitrary notions of their present sovereign, Philip of Spain; nor was it long before every class of men began to remonstrate; the nobility, that they had been deprived of their constitutional weight in the state; the clergy, that the most opulent abbeys, hitherto possessed by natives, had been dissolved to found bishoprics, which were bestowed on strangers; the reformers, that they were the victims of a sanguinary persecution; and the laymen of both persuasions, that their best and dearest privileges were invaded by the illegal proceedings of a new tribunal, formed after the model of the Spanish inquisition.

[1] Becchetti, xii. 107, 108.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1566. April.

To put down this odious institution, both Catholics and Protestants bound themselves to each other by the most solemn engagements. The Compromise (such was the name which they gave to the league) alarmed the duchess of Parma, the governess of the provinces; she commanded the inquisitors to suspend their proceedings, and the reformers, looking on this concession as a victory, rose in arms, for the purpose, as they pretended, of extirpating idolatry, plundered the churches, murdered the priests, and drove the monks and nuns from their convents. Though the duchess, blending firmness with conciliation, had been able to suppress this ebullition of popular fanaticism, Philip deemed her unequal to the task of supporting the sovereign authority in such turbulent times, and chose for her successor Alvarez, duke of Alva, whose principles of passive obedience had recommended him to the favour of the king, and whose military renown struck terror into the hearts of the factious. The men who had been, if not the ostensible leaders, at least the secret abettors, of the preceding troubles, were William, prince of Orange, and the counts Egmont and Horn; all three making open profession of the Catholic creed, though the former, if he had any religion at all, was in heart a Protestant. The prince, anticipating the vengeance of the king, had stolen away to his principality of Nassau. Egmont and Horn awaited the arrival of Alva. The duke entered the Netherlands at the head of fourteen thousand men; in the presence of this force the spirit of opposition melted away; the former edicts were confirmed by others still more rigorous; the penalties of treason were denounced against all who had framed the Compromise, or in-

1567. April.

August.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1567. Sept. 8.

sulted the religion and authority of their sovereign; and the two counts, in consequence of orders received from Philip, were apprehended and imprisoned.

3. The prince of Orange had long been secretly connected with the prince of Condé and the other Protestant leaders in France, who all believed, or affected to believe, that at the interview between the French and Spanish courts at Bayonne, a league had been formed by the Catholic princes for the extirpation, first of the Protestants in France, and then of the Protestants in other countries.[1] Of this league no satisfactory evidence has ever been produced; but the opinion of its existence served the purpose of those who framed the report as effectually as if it had been real. Assuming the arrival of the duke of Alva as the first step in the plan, Condé called a meeting of the French Protestants, in which it was resolved to anticipate their enemies, by surprising

[1] This meeting arose out of the desire of Catherine, the queen-mother of France, to see her daughter Isabella, the Spanish queen. Philip acceded to the request with reluctance, and refused to be present himself, though he sent his wife, under the care of the duke of Alva. Condé and his friends immediately gave out, that some great political object, relative to the destruction of Protestantism, was concealed under the cover of this family meeting; but no proof of this ever appeared; and the question, if it ever was a question, seems to me completely set at rest by the researches of Mr. Von Raumer with respect to the conferences at Bayonne. The documents which he has published fill one hundred pages (Von Raumer, i. 112—122); and yet there is not a passage in them to countenance the suspicion that such a league was ever in the contemplation of the parties at that interview. Sir James Mackintosh thought that he had discovered a proof of such league at an earlier period, soon after the peace of Cateau Cambresis, when the prince of Orange, as it is stated in his declamatory answer to the charges of Philip, drew from the king of France in conversation a disclosure of their designs. But further examination would have proved to him that the whole disclosure amounted only to this, that Philip, having established the inquisition in his own dominions, had advised his French brother to do the like.—See Du Mont, i. v. 392.

CHAP. III.

the court at Monceaux. The project was, however, discovered, and the king escaped with difficulty to Paris, in the midst of a body of Swiss infantry, who, marching in a square, repulsed every charge of the Huguenot cavalry. The English ambassador, Norris, had been deeply implicated in the arrangement of this atrocious, and, in reality, unprovoked attempt; but though the queen, as a sovereign, condemned the outrage, Cecil required Norris to "comfort" the insurgents and exhort them to persevere.[1] Thus a new civil and religious war was lighted up in the heart of France; the king found himself besieged in his capital; and if the insurgents were defeated in the battle of St. Denis, the advantage was dearly purchased with the death of the constable Montmorency. A short pacification was concluded in the spring;[2] but the interval was employed by the Huguenots to carry the flames of war into the Netherlands; and three thousand French Protestants joined the prince of Orange, who had now openly embraced the reformed faith, and had undertaken to expel the Spaniards from Belgium. He sent before him his brother Louis of Nassau, who penetrated into the province of Groningen. At first a partial victory cheered him with the hope of more decisive success; but Alva marched against him with expedition, burst into his intrenchments, and dispersed his army. A few days later, Orange, with twenty thousand men, crossed the Rhine. But it was in vain that the prince offered battle to his wary antagonist; that he encamped and decamped nine-and-twenty times; the vigilance of the duke was not to be surprised; and

A.D. 1567. Aug. 27. Nov. 3. Nov. 10. 1568. March 10. June 5.

[1] Cabala, 143. Davila, 200. Castelnau, l. vi. c. 4.
[2] Benoît, 38. Davila, 224.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

want, mutiny, and desertion compelled the prince to recross the borders and to disband his army.[1]

During these transactions, Elizabeth's ministers had practised their usual policy. In secret they aided the prince of Orange; publicly they maintained the relations of amity with the Spanish monarch.[2] Many of the troops that invaded the Netherlands had been raised at the instigation of the English agents abroad; many had been paid with English money. But chance supplied an easy means of inflicting a more severe wound on the Spanish interest in Belgium. A small fleet of five zabras had sailed from the coast of Biscay for the port of Antwerp. They were laden with wool on account of certain merchants; and with specie to the amount of 550,000 ducats of reals for the payment of the army under the duke of Alva. It was a time when the English Channel was infested with hordes of corsairs, men of every nation, who, under the colour of aiding the cause of their co-religionists in France and the Netherlands, made prizes of French and Spanish merchantmen, and then disposed of them by sale in the English ports with the connivance of the government. Four of the zabras sought refuge in Falmouth and Plymouth; one ventured as far as Southampton Water. Espés, the

1558. Nov. 20.

[1] Meteren, 79. Strada, l. vii. Bentivoglio, 86, 91.

[2] Mann was at this time ambassador at the court of Spain. In the spring of 1568 he was "secluded from the use of his office, and "removed to a village called Bannias, two leagues from Madrid." The cause of this treatment was given out to be the irreverent language which he had used when speaking of the pope (Camden, 175); but, according to Gonzalez, he had called the king a papist and hypocrite, had foretold the triumph of the insurgents in the Netherlands, and had suffered his servants to behave with disrespect in a church at the elevation of the host.—Memorias, 328. Philip complained of him to Elizabeth (April 6) as "no ambassador, but "a perturbator of the peace." She recalled him in June.

ambassador, placed the treasure under the queen's protection, and received from her warrants, authorizing him to transport it at his option by land to Dover, or by sea in English vessels to Antwerp. The agents of the princes of Orange and Condé took alarm; they called to their assistance Cecil and his friends, and with their united arguments and solicitations prevailed on Elizabeth to consent to a temporary detention of the money. As a justification, it was at first suggested to detain it, as security for the repayment of a large sum lent by her father Henry to Charles V., the father of Philip, in 1543, at the siege of Landrecy. The cunning of Cecil exchanged this for a more specious pretext. As an attempt, probably a preconcerted attempt, had been made by a body of corsairs on one of the Spanish ships, it was pretended that the queen was bound in honour to provide for the security of the treasure, and under that colour orders were despatched to the officers at the ports to take possession of the zabras, to discharge the crews, to send the captains up to London, and to transfer the chests and barrels of money to the queen's stores. Espés in alarm demanded, and after a long delay obtained, an audience. But now Elizabeth had another motive for the detention. She had reason to believe that the treasure did not belong to the king of Spain, but to certain foreign bankers, who had sent it to Flanders for their own profit. He put into her hands a certificate from the duke of Alva, that it was the bonâ fide property of the king, forwarded by him for the sole purpose of the payment of his army. She replied that a few days would clear up her doubt on that head. If it belonged to Philip, it should be restored

A.D. 1558. Nov. 29. Dec. 18. Dec. 21. Dec. 29.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1558.

to him; if to the bankers, she would keep it for her own use, paying to them the usual rate of interest.

Alva had already heard of the seizure of the money, and aware of the object of the English ministry, on

Dec. 29.

this very day, by way of reprisal, took possession of the English factory at Antwerp, made its inmates prisoners, and kept the ships and merchandise for

1569. Jan. 6.

an indemnity. To retaliate, the goods of the subjects of Philip in England were now seized, and the ambassador was confined in his own house, under the inspection of three gentlemen stationed there as warders. Hence new claims, complaints, and recriminations became mixed up with the controversy; the settlement of the original question was protracted, and postponed indefinitely, and the military operations of Alva were paralyzed by the loss of the money for the payment of his army. There were, indeed, among the colleagues of Cecil several who disputed the policy as well as the honesty of these proceedings; but they dared not openly oppose him, and absenting themselves under pretext of indisposition from the council, left to him the whole responsibility of severing the ancient league between the English crown and the house of Burgundy, and of putting an end to the commercial relations which for two centuries had proved a plentiful source of wealth to both countries.[1]

It might have been expected that hostilities would immediately ensue. But the resentment of Philip

[1] See the queen's proclamation in defence of this seizure, the answer to that proclamation by the ambassador, and several notices respecting the transaction in the despatches of Fénélon, i. 43, 59, 76, 89, 96, 104, 107, 119, 126; Cabala, 158, 160; Murdin, 766; Haynes, 501; Camden, 175.

was checked by the prudence of Alva, who advised him not to draw so powerful an enemy on himself, before he had reduced the insurgents in the Netherlands. He was even prevailed upon to send a commissioner to treat on the subject in London. Conferences were opened, and suspended, and prolonged; so that during four years it was difficult to say whether the two crowns were at war or peace, Elizabeth aiding the insurgents with money, and raising men in Germany for their service, and Philip supporting the exiles in Flanders, and keeping alive the hopes of the discontented, both in England and Ireland. A.D. 1569.

The princes of Orange and Condé had constantly acted in concert; and the former had no sooner retreated from Belgium than the flames of war burst out for the third time in the heart of France. Each party laid the blame on the perfidy of the other; and both the king and the prince sought to strengthen themselves with the aid of foreign powers. Condé, not content with the promises of the prince of Orange, and the offers of the duke of Deuxponts, despatched Chastillon, and afterwards Cavaignes, into England.[1] But the disgraceful termination of her former attempt in France had taught Elizabeth a useful lesson; and to overcome her repugnance to join in the present war, it was observed to her, that the cause of the French Protestants was her own; that the moment they should be subdued, the queen of Scots would be recognized by the Catholic powers as queen of England; that Mary had already transferred her 1568. Sept. 17.

[1] Chastillon was the brother of the admiral Coligni, and, though a cardinal, had embraced the reformed creed with the rest of his family. He resided several years in England as the principal agent for the party.

CHAP. III. A.D. 1568.

right to the duke of Anjou; that the pope had granted to him the investiture of the kingdom; and, what ought to remove every doubt, the command of the army which should invade England had been already offered to Condé.[1] For a while the queen gave credit to these fables; she consented to aid the prince with twenty thousand pounds, and a certain quantity of military stores, on pretence of payment for wine and salt to the same value; opened her ports to receive the prizes taken from the French and Belgic Catholics, and suffered Chastillon to sell them as the property of Condé, and to transmit the money to the insurgents.[2] The king of France complained that England supplied the wants of his rebellious subjects, and that Norris, the ambassador, was one of the chief instigators of the troubles within his dominions. But the ingenuity of Cecil supplied him with evasions; and Norris was exhorted to persevere in defiance of the remonstrances and threats of the French monarch The cause of the insurgents met, however, with repeated disappointments. Condé fell

1569. March 13.

in the battle of Jarnac; Dandelot died of an infectious fever; and the admiral Coligni, the chief hope of the Huguenots, was defeated by the duke of

[1] Haynes, 474. This tale, so likely to raise angry and vindictive feelings in the breast of the English queen, was for a long time firmly believed by her. She gave no credit to repeated denials by Mary Stuart, but was at last satisfied (August 17) by formal written declarations from the king of France, the queen-mother, the duke of Anjou, the cardinal of Lorrain, and the archbishop of Glasgow, that there was not an atom of truth in the report. —Fénélon, ii. 178. The declarations of the king and the duke have been published in Fénélon, i. 431—435, immediately after three other documents (p. 425—431), with which they have no connection whatsoever. It is plain that though they are numbered consecutively, the fourth and fifth refer to a transaction supposed to have taken place in 1569; the other three were signed in 1559.

[2] Thuan. ii. 696.

Anjou at Montcontour. From this period the queen of England ceased not to exhort both parties to sheathe the sword; and a third edict of pacification was published in the course of the following year.[1] A.D. 1569. Oct. 3. 1570. August 15.

How far such perpetual interference of the English government in the internal concerns of foreign states could be justified by the apprehension of future danger, I shall not stop to inquire; but Elizabeth could have no reason to complain, if, after what had passed, the French and Spanish kings should convert her own policy against herself. Hitherto, indeed, they deemed it prudent to dissemble, that they might not, by open hostility, compel her to make common cause with their discontented subjects; but they cherished the recollection of the injuries which they had received, and trusted that the day would come when they should be able to take just and ample revenge.[2]

[1] Cabala, 152, 154, 155, 165. Murdin, 766.

[2] Dissimulare malebat Philippus ne ludibrio esset, ira in tempus dilata.—Bomplani Pontificatus Greg. XIII. 235. From the despatches of the French and Spanish ambassadors, it appears that they made innumerable complaints to the queen of the aid given to the insurgents. Sometimes she had recourse to evasions; sometimes she justified her conduct by fairly alleging the supposed league for the extirpation of Protestantism. But when she was called upon for proof of the existence of such league, she could produce only conjecture and report. They assured her that it was a fiction, devised and employed to alarm her and her Protestant subjects.—See Fénélon, i. 229, 323; ii. 5, 20, 23, 47, 106.

CHAPTER IV.

CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING THE SCOTTISH QUEEN—PENAL LAWS AGAINST THE CATHOLICS—PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE PURITANS—DETECTION OF A CONSPIRACY—TRIAL AND EXECUTION OF THE DUKE OF NORFOLK—CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE—CIVIL WAR IN THE NETHERLANDS—THE DUKE OF ANJOU ACCEPTS THE SOVEREIGNTY—VISITS THE QUEEN OF ENGLAND—THEY PROMISE TO MARRY EACH OTHER—HIS DEPARTURE AND DEATH—AFFAIRS OF IRELAND.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1570.

MORE than two years had elapsed since the arrival of Mary in England; and she was still a captive, still her fate was held in suspense. To indifferent persons her detention appeared a most cruel and arbitrary measure; by the counsellors of Elizabeth, it was justified on the ground of expediency. They saw that her right to the succession was generally admitted. Should she survive their mistress, they could anticipate nothing but danger to themselves from her resentment, and danger to the reformed church from her attachment to the ancient worship. It was moreover known that in the estimation of many she had a better claim to the present possession of the crown than Elizabeth herself. If a favourable opportunity were to offer, could it be doubted that the kings of France and Spain, in revenge of the injuries which they had received, and the Catholics of England, to relieve themselves from the pressure of persecuting laws, would unite and place her on the English

throne? In their opinion, the very existence of the government and of the established worship was at stake.[1] CHAP. IV. A.D. 1570.

The shortest and most certain expedient was to go boldly to the root of the evil, and by the death of Mary to extinguish at once the hopes and the designs of her partisans. This, during several years, was strongly and repeatedly urged by some of the council.[2] If it was rejected by Elizabeth, her repugnance arose less from motives of humanity than of decency. She was willing that Mary should perish, but was ashamed to imbrue her own hands in the blood of a sister-queen. Hence she offered to transfer the royal captive to the hands of the Scottish regent, provided he would give security that she should be removed out of the way; and hence the earl of Shrewsbury was made to engage, that Mary should be put to death on the very first attempt to rescue her from his custody.[3]

In the supposition that the Scottish queen were suffered to live, the marriage of Elizabeth into the royal house of France had been suggested by Cecil, and was supported by the earl of Sussex.[4] Then, if the queen had issue, Mary would cease to be the presumptive heir; if she had none, the French monarch would still have a strong interest in maintaining Elizabeth on the throne. Leicester and Hatton, the queen's minions, as they were called,

[1] Such apprehensions perpetually occur in the State Papers of this reign. "Our chief object," says Leicester, "are these two "things, that the queen may be preserved in safety, and the true "religion maintained assuredly" (51).

[2] See Digges, 203, 263, 268, 269, 276. Part of Leicester's letter in Murdin (231) refers to the same object.

[3] Murdin, 224. Lodge, ii. 96.

[4] See his opinion at length in Lodge, ii. 177—186.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1570.

advocated the same opinion in public; in private they whispered, so at least it was said, very different sentiments in the royal ear.[1]

There was another party, consisting of Bromley, Mildmay, Sadler, and Sidney, who ridiculed the dangers apprehended by their colleagues, and maintained that the queen, by persevering in the conduct which she had hitherto observed, might continue to reign with equal safety and glory. She had only to keep down the discontented at home by the severity of the laws, and to occupy the attention of her enemies abroad by preserving alive the spirit of revolt in their dominions, and she would still be the terror of her own subjects, and the arbitress of the neighbouring powers.[2] In this opinion the other two parties, as long as they could not carry their favourite projects, concurred. But experience proved that they had to treat with a fickle and obstinate woman, who was swayed as much by passion as by reason; and who, in a sudden fit of pride, or terror, or parsimony, would often reject their advice, and break all their measures.

In the autumn of 1570, the solicitations of Mary, the attempts of her friends in England,[3] and the remonstrances of the French and Spanish monarchs, extorted from Elizabeth a promise to fix the conditions on which her captive might at last be restored to liberty. For this purpose, Cecil and Mildmay re-

Oct. 5.

[1] Digges, 343. Camden, 276, 322, 329. Lodge, ii. 184.

[2] Murdin, 326, 327, 333, 334. Sadler, ii. 563.

[3] Several persons undertook to liberate her from her captivity, among whom were Sir Thomas Stanley and Sir Edward Stanley, younger sons of the earl of Derby; Sir Henry Percy, brother to the earl of Northumberland; Sir Thomas Gerard, Rolleston, Hall, Owen, and others.—Camden, 276. Murdin, 20—22, 35.

paired to Chatsworth, where the Scottish queen had been confined for the last four months.[1] During the negotiation, which continued a fortnight, that princess proved herself a match for these wily and experienced statesmen; but the necessity of her situation compelled her to yield in a manner to all their demands, and to throw herself on the mercy of her English sister, with respect to those points which bore the hardest on her maternal and religious feelings. Elizabeth professed to be satisfied; the only thing wanting to a complete accord was the assent of the two parties in Scotland, called the king's and the queen's lords.[2] The first, with Morton at their head, read to Elizabeth, in defence of their proceedings, a long lecture on the abstract right of subjects to depose immoral or lawless sovereigns; a most uncourtly doctrine, to which she listened with an evil grace, and replied with expres-

1571. Feb. 11.

[1] Cecil did not like the appointment. "I am thrown into a maze, "that I know not how to walk from dangers. Sir Walter Mildmay "and I are sent to the Scottish queen. God be our guide; for "neither of us like the message."—Cabala, 179.

[2] One of the most singular propositions submitted to Mary was that she should forbear all claim to the crown of England, "whilest "the queen's majestie and *any issue* to come of her body shall lyve," so that the queen of Scots should not be deprived of any right of hers, "yf God should not give to the queenis majestie *any issue* of "her bodye to have continuance." Mary consented, but on condition that in both places the word "lawful" should be inserted before "issue." To this the commissioners demurred; and after a debate of some days it was allowed, in consequence of new but angry instructions from the English queen, to stand thus, "any "issue by any lawful husband."—Haynes, 608, 614. It is remarkable that Elizabeth would never allow the expression, "heirs law-"fully to be begotten," used in the statute of the first of her reign, to be employed afterwards, but substituted in its place the "natural "issue of her body;" and the more remarkable, because she knew of a scandalous report that she had already had two children by Leicester. Only the last August a gentleman named Marsham had been tried at Norfolk, for saying, "that my lord of Leicester "had ii childerne by the queene; and was condemned to lowse both "his eares, or ells pay *cl.* presently."—Lodge, ii. 47.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

sions of displeasure. With those of the latter the chief subjects of discussion were the securities to be given by the queen of Scots; a discussion which was protracted from day to day by the usual irresolution of Elizabeth. On the one hand she feared to restore to her crown a princess whom she had so deeply injured; on the other she deemed it dangerous and disgraceful to sanction by her authority the democratic doctrine of the king's lords. She balanced so long between the two extremes, that her favourite counsellors could not divine the result;[1] she was rescued from this state of suspense by suggestions of the French Protestants, aided by the policy of Cecil, whom she had lately raised to the peerage by the title of Baron Burghley.[2]

Feb. 25.

Ever since the edict of pacification in France, mentioned in the last chapter, it had been a favourite object with the leaders of the Huguenots to bring about a marriage between the English queen and the duke of Anjou, the eldest of the two brothers of Charles IX. Chastillon first ventured to break the subject to Elizabeth, and to his great satisfaction obtained from her permission to proceed with his plan. He then attempted to sound the disposition of the royal family in France, by a message to Catherine de Medicis, the queen-mother. She received the proposal very coldly; not that she was blind to the benefits which her family and the French crown

1570. Oct. 20.

[1] "Believe me," says Leicester, "whatever you may hear, there "is no man in England can tell you which way it will go."—Digges, 57. See note (L).

[2] Mary said openly of Cecil, that "he was her enemy, and "would cause her to be made away."—Haynes, 511. Leicester told Fénélon, that "Cecil was her sworn enemy (ennemy conjuré), "and continually diverted the queen from doing anything in her "favour."—Fénélon, iii. 100.

might derive from such marriage, but because she looked upon the suggestion as an artifice of the English minister, who had some very different object in view. Repeated messages and hints induced her at last to view the matter in a more favourable light; but to her great mortification, Anjou sent her word by the king, his brother, that he could not think of disgracing himself by taking for his wife a woman who had no regard for her own honour. He was too well acquainted with the character of the English queen, from the despatches of all the ambassadors and envoys who, of late years, had visited the English court.[1] More than a fortnight passed before she could extort from her son his assent; still she was apprehensive of making him, as so many others had been made, the dupe of Elizabeth's caprice, and resolved, if it were possible, to extract information from Lord Buckhurst, the ambassador. Meeting him, as if it had been by accident, in the garden of the Tuilleries, she entered into conversation with him, and was very frankly informed that the queen his mistress had determined for divers weighty reasons to marry forthwith, but on this condition, that her husband should not be a subject of her own, nor a foreigner of any

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1570. —

1571. Feb. 2.

Feb. 18.

March 2.

[1] Mon fils m'a faict dire par le roy qu'il ne la veut jamais espouser, quand bien elle le voudroit, d'aultant qu'il a toujours si mal oui parler de son honneur, et en a veu des lettres escrites de tous les ambassadeurs, qui y ont este, qu'il penseroit estre deshonnoré.—The queen-mother to Fénélon (Depesches, vii. 179). The ambassador meets the objection indirectly in the following manner: L'on a peu diversement escriper et parler de ceste princesse, sur l'oyr dire des gens, qui quelque foys ne pardonnent a ceulx mesmes qui sont les meilleurs, mais de tant qu'en sa court l'on ne voyt que ung bon ordre, et elle y estre bien fort honoree et ententive en ses affaires, et que les plus grandz de son royaulme et toutz ses subjectz la craignent et reverent, et elle ordonne d'eulx et sur eulx avec pleine authorite j'ai estimé que cela ne pouvoit proceder de personne mal famée, et on il n'y eust de la vertu.—Vol. iv. p. 11.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

but a royal house. More than this he could not say, for it was not becoming in the female to act the part of the wooer. But the impatience of Elizabeth condescended to act that part. She sent her portrait as a present to the French prince, complained of the little credit paid to her repeated protestations of sincerity,[1] and received at last, through Cavalcanti,[2] a proposal of marriage in due form from Anjou himself. Whilst, however, her mind was eagerly intent on this new pursuit, her anxiety to come to a final accord with Mary Stuart appeared to cool, and the enemies of the Scottish queen improved the opportunity to break off the conferences. The commissioners, on the part of the young king, were remanded, on the ground that they had come without sufficient powers; those of Mary were dismissed, with a recommendation to be ready against the return of their adversaries. The whole was an artifice to gain time; if the marriage with Anjou should take place, no accord with Mary would be requisite; if it did not, the treaty might be renewed at the will of Elizabeth.[3]

April 11.

March 26.

[1] Elle prioit Dieu de ne luy donner a vivre une heure apres qu'elle auroit pensé de user de moquerie.—Fénélon, iv. 41.

[2] Guido Cavalcanti, an Italian of noble family, had originally been employed by the duke of Alva in missions to the courts of England and France, in both of which he became a great favourite with the sovereigns.

[3] In a letter of April 8th, Elizabeth is made to inform Walsingham, that when she "minded to make a final end of the business, "she found that the earl of Morton and his colleagues had no suffi- "cient commission; they therefore go home to obtain one, which "done, she trusts shortly to make an end of the controversy."—Digges, 77. Yet all this is a tissue of falsehood. At the very commencement Morton informed the council (February 19) that he had no power to negotiate respecting the restoration of Mary to the royal authority.—Haynes, 623. And Cecil, on March 24th and April 7th, told Walsingham, "that it was only devised to win "delay;" and therefore "he must make the best of it, and seek "out reasons to satisfy the French court."—Digges, 67, 78.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571. April 2.

Scarcely were the commissioners departed, when the parliament commenced. The late occurrences, the rebellion in the north, the publication of the papal bull, and the unlicensed departure from England of the lord Morley and several other gentlemen, suggested to the ministers several new enactments, which had for their chief object to check the boldness of the partisans of Mary, and to cut off the communication between the English Catholics and the court of Rome. The first bill was divided into two parts. By one it was proposed to make it treason in any individual to claim a right to the crown during the queen's life; or to assert that it belonged to any other person than the queen; or to publish that she was a heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel, or usurper; or to deny that the descent and inheritance of the crown was determinable by the statutes made in parliament; by the other to punish, with one year's imprisonment for the first offence, and with the penalty of premunire for the second, all persons who should by writing or printing affirm that any one particular person was the heir of the queen, except the same were "the natural "issue of her body."[1] Another bill enacted the penalties of treason against all persons who should sue for, obtain, or put in use any bull, writing, or instrument from the bishop of Rome, or absolve or be absolved in virtue of such bulls or writings;[2] and the penalties of

[1] Incredibile est quos jocos improbi verborum aucupes sibi fecerunt ex clausula illa, præter naturalem ex ipsius corpore sobolem.—Camden, 241. The next year she was troubled with fits, which gave rise to conjectures and reports. "I assure you," says Leicester to Walsingham, "it is not as has been reported. Some-"what, indeed, her majesty hath been troubled with a spice or "shew of the mother, but indeed not so. The fits that she hath "had hath not been above a quarter of an hour; and yet this little "hath bred strange bruites here at home."—Digges, 288.

[2] At the last Norfolk assizes three gentlemen were "condemned

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571. premunire against their aiders and abettors, and all others who should introduce or receive the things called agnus Dei, and crosses, pictures, or beads blessed by the bishop of Rome, or others deriving their authority from him; a third compelled all individuals above a certain age, not only to attend the established service, but also to receive the communion after the new form; and a fourth ordered every person who had left, or who should leave the realm, either with or without license, to return in six months after warning by proclamation, under the penalty of forfeiting his goods and chattels, and the profits of his lands during life, to the use of the queen. These bills diffused the most serious alarm through the whole body of the Catholics. It was evident that the ministers sought the total extinction of the ancient faith. The Catholic lords, a large portion of the house, assembled; they complained that, if the bills passed, they could neither remain within the kingdom without offence to their consciences, nor leave it without the sacrifice of their fortunes; and they determined to wait in a body on the queen, and present to her a strong but respectful remonstrance. This project, however, was abandoned; but, at the same time, the bill respecting the frequentation of communion, the most harassing in its probable consequences, was dropped. The other three passed the two houses, and received the royal assent.[1]

But in addition to the Catholics, there was another

"to perpetual imprisonment, with the losse of all their goods and "lands during their lives, for reconsilement."—Lodge, ii. 46. A man was said to be reconciled, who, after he had gone to the new service, returned to the Catholic worship, and received absolution. This religious offence by the new statute was made high treason.

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 528.

class of religionists that gave the queen perpetual cause of disquietude. These were the Puritans; they derived their origin from some of the exiled ministers, who, during the reign of Mary, had imbibed the opinions of Calvin, and on their return urged the queen to a further reformation. They approved of much that had been done; but they also complained that many things had been left untouched, to which they could not accommodate their consciences. They objected to the superiority of the bishops and the jurisdiction of the episcopal courts; to the repetition of the Lord's prayer, to the responses of the people, and to the reading of the apocryphal lessons in the liturgy; to the sign of the cross in the administration of baptism, and to the ring and the words of the contract in that of marriage; to the observance of festivals, the chant of the psalms, and the use of musical instruments in cathedral churches; and, above all, to the habits, "the very livery of the beast," enjoined to be worn by the ministers during the celebration of the service.[1]

It is pretty evident that the queen herself had formed no settled notions of religion. Policy had induced her to adopt the reformed creed; policy equally taught her to repress the zeal or the fanaticism of these ultra-reformers. On the one hand, the less she receded from the ancient model, the more easily would her Catholic subjects be brought to conform to the new worship; on the other, there had been much in the previous conduct of the Puritans to wound and alarm her pride and her feelings. They had written against the government of females; they still taught that the church ought to be independent of the state.

[1] Neal's Puritans, c. iv. v.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

It was in vain that they offered apologies for the obnoxious works; that they took the oath of supremacy in the sense which she had given to it in her injunctions; though they were secretly supported by the most favoured and powerful of her ministers, she retained to the last a rooted antipathy against their doctrines, an insuperable jealousy of all their proceedings.

By the assumption of the supremacy, it had become the duty of Elizabeth to watch over the purity of doctrine, the maintenance of discipline, and the decency of the public worship; and, when it was asked how a female could execute these functions, or exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the legislature solved the difficulty by enabling her to avail herself of the services of delegates appointed by the crown. These she armed with the most formidable and inquisitorial powers. They were authorized to inquire, on the oath of the person accused, and on the oaths of witnesses, of all heretical, erroneous, and dangerous opinions; of absence from the established service, and the frequentation of private conventicles; of seditious books and libels against the queen, her magistrates and ministers; and of adulteries, fornications, and all other offences cognizable by the ecclesiastical law; and to punish the offenders by spiritual censures, by fine, imprisonment, and deprivation.[1]

[1] Rymer, xvi. 291, 564. Whoever will compare the powers given to this tribunal with those of the Inquisition, which Philip II. endeavoured to establish in the Low Countries, will find that the chief difference between the two courts consisted in their names. One was the court of Inquisition, the other of High Commission. In the first commissions (see one in Strype's Grindal, App. 64) the power of interrogating the person accused on his oath was not expressly inserted; yet the judges always attempted it, because

The first victims who felt the vengeance of this tribunal, called the High Commission court, were the Catholics; from the Catholics its attention was soon directed to the Puritans. CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

Archbishop Parker, as chief commissioner, had with the aid of his colleagues compiled certain ordinances respecting the apparel of the clergy and the order of the service. He undertook the task by command of the queen; but she was advised by the enemies of the measure to refuse her approbation, and the ordinances were at last published under the more modest title of advertisements. Still, however, she urged the commissioners to the discharge of their duty. Sampson, dean of Christ Church, and Humphreys, president of Magdalen College, were imprisoned for their disobedience; thirty-seven out of the London clergy were suspended from the exercise of their functions; and an intimation was given, that unless they should conform within the space of three months, their obstinacy would be visited with the punishment of deprivation.[1] 1564. 1567. March 26.

This act of rigour, instead of producing uniformity, led to an open schism. The lay Puritans abandoned the churches, and held private meetings for the purpose of religious worship. But "conventicles" came within the jurisdiction of the delegates. More than one hundred persons, apprehended at a meeting in Plumber's Hall, were brought before the High Commission court; those who refused to acknowledge their offence were committed; and of the prisoners, twenty-four men and seven women did not recover their liberty till the expiration of twelve months.

they were ordered to inquire "by all ways and means they could "devise."

[1] Wilk. Con. iv. 246, 247. Strype's Parker, 158.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1567.

But the experience of ages has shown that religious opinions are not to be eradicated by severity. If the Puritans were silenced in the church, they had still access to the senate; and, as soon as the parliament opened, not fewer than seven bills, for a further reformation, were introduced into the lower house. To the queen such conduct appeared an act of high treason against her supremacy; and during the Easter recess, Strickland, the mover of the bills, received an order to withdraw, and to attend the pleasure of the council. After the adjournment, his absence was noticed by his colleagues. It was moved that he should be called to the bar of the house, that he might state the reason of his absence; he was not a private individual, but the representative of his constituents; the prohibition which he had received was an injury to the country, a violation of parliamentary privilege; if it was tamely submitted to by the house, it would form a most dangerous precedent; as the queen could not make the law, so she had no right to break it; her prerogative was, indeed, to be maintained, but it should be confined within reasonable limits; that house could determine the right to the crown, certainly it could entertain motions respecting religious ceremonies. Language, so bold and so unusual, electrified the members; the obstinacy of the ministers flinched before the untamable spirit of their opponents; and, after a consultation in whispers, the speaker moved that the debate should be suspended. The next morning Strickland appeared in his place, and was received with loud congratulations.[1]

1571. April 6.

April 20.

[1] D'Ewes's Journal, 156, 175, 176. An act was, however, passed, to compel all clergymen to subscribe, and declare their unfeigned assent to, the thirty-nine articles. The judges inter-

This victory was owing to that tone of mind which religious enthusiasm always imparts. It formed a new era in the history of the house of Commons. The members learned to cherish their privileges, to think more highly of their own importance, to resist, with greater confidence, the arbitrary pretensions of the crown. Yet it is observable, that these very men, who thus, through religious motives, braved the resentment of their sovereign, possessed, in reality, no notions of religious liberty. When Aglionby, in opposition to the bill for compelling all persons to receive the communion, pleaded the rights of conscience, he was told by some, "that it was no straitening of "consciences, but only a charge on the goods of those "who would not vouchsafe to be, as they should be, "good men and true Christians;" by others, that it was the duty of the house to make the law; if men were froward, or ignorant, or obstinate, let *them* look to the consequences. They had no one to blame but themselves.[1]

The queen, however, did not suffer her opponents to depart without a severe reprimand. On the dissolution of the parliament, the lord-keeper, by her command, informed them that their conduct was thought contrary to their duty and their place; that, as they had forgotten themselves, they should be otherwise remembered; and "that the queen's highness did "utterly disallow and condemn their folly, in meddling

May 29.

preted it to mean all the articles without exception; but the Puritans, relying on the obvious signification of the words, "all "the articles of religion, which only concern the confession of the "true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments," maintained that no assent was required to the articles which regarded discipline.—Stat. of Realm, iv. 546. See Collier, ii. 530; Neal, c. v.

[1] D'Ewes's Journal, 161, 177.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

"with things not appertaining to them, nor within the "capacity of their understandings."[1]

In the meanwhile the proposal of marriage between Elizabeth and the duke of Anjou, though entertained on each side, made but little progress. The queen depended on the judgment of Burghley, who allowed months to pass before he could make up his mind; but at last acknowledged that it was the most eligible measure that could be adopted for the security of the throne.[2] On the other hand, Philip of Spain, apprehensive that, if it took place, the power of England would be joined with that of France, to wrest the Netherlands from his dominion, resolved to spare neither pains nor cost in raising up enemies to the project. His agents, to win the friendship of Elizabeth, yielded to all her demands; consented that she should keep the treasure taken from the ships, and arrange with the bankers from whom Philip had borrowed it, and even agreed to pay to her a large sum, as compensation for the merchandise seized at Antwerp. At the same time they urged on the consideration of the more zealous Protestants the danger to which their religion would be exposed, if at the death of the queen a Catholic prince should be left in possession of the throne; attempted to purchase the

[1] Ibid. 151. During this session an attempt was made by a Mr. Norton to obtain the sanction of parliament for the new code of canon law composed in the reign of Edward VI., which was now published with a preface by Foxe, the martyrologist. But it was opposed by the Puritans, who were unwilling to add to the power of the bishops, and by the queen's ministers, who deemed the project derogatory from her authority.

[2] Leicester tells Fénélon that Burghley ne veult en façon du monde que sa Mestresse ayt, ni lui (Leicester), ni nul autre mary que soy mesmes, qui est Roy plus qu'elle.—Fénélon, iii. 462. Il y est tres affectionné (iv. 156, 190).

services of influential persons in the council and the household, by offers of pensions and gratuities; and made presents of jewelry and money to the ladies of the court, most in the confidence of the sovereign.[1] Though Elizabeth herself appeared to feel a pleasure in talking of her approaching nuptials, still she often betrayed the habitual indecision of her character. One day she was determined to marry; she would sacrifice her own feelings in favour of a single life to the welfare of her people, in the hope that by leaving to them an heir of her body, she might save them from the evils of a disputed succession; on the next day it was her determination not to marry; she was too old to captivate the fancy of a young prince; and too wise to condemn herself to a life of jealousy and domestic bickering.[2] Shortly, however, it turned out that the real objector was Anjou himself. He had, indeed, at the command of his brother, professed an earnest wish for the success of the negotiation; he had even gone so far as to let the queen know that in his estimation "she was the most perfect beauty that God had made "during the last five hundred years."[3] But he could not conceal his dissimulation from the keen eye of his mother Catherine, who ascribed his reluctance to the counsels of his favourites Lignerolles, Villequier, and Sarret.[4] They, however, were saved from her vengeance by a dispute which grew out of the treaty itself. When almost every other article had been settled, the duke required the insertion of a clause securing to him the free exercise of his religion. This the queen was advised to refuse as contrary to law. He then required a promise to the same effect in her

[1] Fénélon, iv. 220, 302.
[2] Id. iv. 13, 23, 107, 190, 219, 239.
[3] Digges, 101.
[4] Fénélon, vii. 234.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

handwriting.[1] She returned another refusal; on the receipt of which Anjou replied, that then he must resign the honour which she had offered to him; for his religion was as dear to him as hers might be to her. She could not conceal her disappointment, and peevishly observed, that he was too hasty; he might have been content with her bare word; she could have done for him what she did for the Catholic peers, who with her connivance had mass celebrated in their own houses. Probably her vexation was not lessened by the recollection of Anjou's refusal at the very outset. She would still suspect that, notwithstanding his denial, he continued to give credit to the scandalous tales respecting her amours with Leicester and Hatton.[2]

Burghley, however, was not left without resource. On the treaty of marriage he had been careful to engraft a second treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, from which he proposed to derive all the benefits which could have been derived from the marriage itself. To this the council now clung as to the last plank, according to their own language, which could save them from destruction. A long negotiation ensued; months were employed to decide the insertion or exclusion of a single word; and at length the treaty was concluded to the satisfaction of the English cabinet.[3]

1572. April 22.

[1] Fénélon, vii. 252.

[2] See Fénélon, iv. from p. 305 to p. 354, and the correspondence of Leicester and Burghley with Walsingham, Digges, 63, 65, 71, 110, 115, 116, 133, 139, 153, 161, 166, 196.

[3] Camden, ii. 265. The great difficulty was, that Elizabeth wished to have inserted in the article, which bound the king of France to give her aid in case of an invasion, these words, "though "the invasion be made on account of religion." It was objected, that so open an assertion would justly give offence to all Catholic sovereigns; and the queen at last accepted the treaty with the following amendment: "in all cases of invasion whatsoever." The

All the suitors of Mary Stuart appear to have treated with her as if she were a single woman, and at full liberty to marry. But was she not actually the wife of Earl Bothwell? This question seems to have claimed her attention at the time of her engagement to the duke of Norfolk. She confided the secret particulars of her unhappy marriage with Bothwell to the bishop of Ross, who appears to have pronounced it null and void on two grounds,—1. Because her verbal consent had been extorted by the violence and brutality of the earl, and 2. Because Bothwell himself was at that time a married man, notwithstanding his pretended divorce from Janet Gordon.[1] Originally it was intended that Ross should proceed to Rome, to procure an authoritative opinion from the pope; but he was detained in London during the conferences about the end of 1570, in which he acted as Mary's representative, aided with the advice of Ridolphi and the Spanish ambassador. When it became manifest that the conferences were merely a delusion, these three foreigners arranged among themselves the plan of another insurrection in favour of the Scottish queen. But the failure of the last had taught them an important lesson,—the necessity of a previous understanding with the foreign prince on whose co-operation they relied. For this purpose Ridolphi offered his services; so extensive, he said, were his mercantile and monetary concerns, that he was well known in every country in Europe; nor was there a court which he

king gave, in addition, a written explanation, that invasion on account of religion was comprehended in these words.—Digges, 155, et seq. Murdin, 213.

[1] See Lettres de Marie, iii. 57; Apuntamientos, 219. Camden tells us that the pope had already annulled her marriage with Bothwell.—Camd. 217. But that cannot be; for we find her soliciting a divorce much later by means of Ridolphi.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

might not visit without exciting any reasonable cause of suspicion in the English cabinet.

In the beginning of February, Mary Stuart received from him a letter, in which he advised her to put no more trust in the pretended friendship of Elizabeth, but to send an agent to the princes her friends on the continent to solicit their aid; then detailed at length the qualities which such agent ought to possess, qualities which evidently in his opinion centred in his own person.[1] Mary replied in cipher to the bishop of Ross, that Philip of Spain was the only crowned head from whom in existing circumstances she could hope for effectual succour; that she knew of no one fitter to be employed in obtaining it than Ridolphi, "under colour "of his traffique;" that the great difficulty which he would have to remove would arise from the religion of the duke of Norfolk, whom she had engaged to marry; but that they must consult the duke, and be governed by his advice. This letter is of importance, as it bore a great share in the production of the tragedy which followed.[2]

Norfolk had been released from the Tower in the month of August, and was now in his own house, but under the custody of Sir Henry Neville. To him, therefore, the conspirators had no access; but Ross had made a friend of a gentleman of his household, named Barker, through whom he forwarded messages to the duke. It was evident that Ridolphi, to succeed in his mission, must take credentials from the parties who sent him. From Mary credentials were

[1] From an original document in cipher, indorsed "Memoire de "ce que le seigneur Rodolphi a faict entendre a la Royne," in the possession of the Right Rev. Dr. Kyle, Presholm, in Banffshire.

[2] Lettres de Marie, iii. 180.

soon obtained, fabricated probably in London, but ratified with her signature. In them she was made to state, that her friends in England had determined to risk their lives and fortunes, for the double purpose of establishing her right to the succession, and of restoring the exercise of the Catholic worship; that the duke of Norfolk, the first in rank, and the highest in popularity of the English peerage, had placed himself at their head; that the only thing wanting to the success of the enterprise was military and pecuniary aid, which she hoped to obtain from the royal feelings and Catholic zeal of foreign princes; that no objection ought to be made on account of the Protestant religion of the duke; for it would be impolitic for him to declare himself a Catholic now; his past conduct had proved him to be a friend to Catholics, and his future conduct would display a devoted obedience to the commands of the pontiff and the Spanish monarch. The amount of the aid to be granted she would leave to the duke himself, and ended with a request to the pontiff that he would judicially declare the nullity of her forced marriage with Bothwell.[1]

At the same time a letter of credence from the duke of Norfolk was fabricated for Ridolphi, undoubtedly by the same individuals. The duke was made to say, that in the name of the queen of Scots, of himself, and of the greater part of the English nobility, whose names were registered in another paper, he authorized Ridolphi to solicit the aid of the pope and of Philip in favour of the very important enterprise, at

[1] Lettres de Marie, iii. 222—253. Prince Labanoff has published the credentials of both Mary and Norfolk from the archives of the Vatican, where they had remained in secrecy two hundred and seventy years. For the Spanish copies left by Ridolphi at Madrid, see Apuntamientos, 215; and Memorias, vii. 360.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

the head of which he had been placed.[1] Its object was to establish the right of that princess, to restore the ancient worship, to free her, and himself, and the Catholics of England, from the persecutions which they suffered; and to remove from the government that knot of Huguenots, who, to disseminate their own religion, were constantly fomenting and maintaining religious wars in every neighbouring Catholic country. It was true that he had not declared himself; because he would not forfeit the services of his Protestant friends, but he pledged himself to be hereafter ordered on that subject by the pope and the king, if with their assistance he should succeed in his attempt. The succour which he requested must amount to six thousand musketeers, two thousand pikemen, twenty-five field-pieces, four thousand spare muskets for volunteers, a sufficiency of military stores, and officers experienced in the art of war. If such an army could be spared from the Spanish garrisons in the Netherlands, he would join them on their arrival at Harwich in Norfolk, or in Portsmouth in Sussex, with three thousand horse and twenty thousand foot. In short, to rid themselves from the evils which they suffered, the duke and his friends were resolved to risk the issue of a battle even with their own forces, and to make themselves masters, if it were possible, of the

[1] Io d'ogni mio interesse, et in nome della magior parte de nobili di questo regno, delli quali con questa havete li nomi particulari di ciascuno. Ridolphi left with this letter a list of names, but undoubtedly for the purpose of deception. Instead of being a list of those in whose name he was said to have been sent, it turns out to be a list of the peerage, with the peers divided into three classes,—of thirty-nine favourable to the marriage of Norfolk with the queen of Scots, of six hostile to it, and of fifteen indifferent. It was a paper evidently drawn up a year before the mission of Ridolphi.

person of Elizabeth, to keep her as security for the life of the queen of Scots.[1]

There is much to throw doubt and distrust on the authenticity of this document. The astounding assertion that the duke was deputed by the majority of the English nobility to solicit from the king of Spain an invasion of the kingdom, the vapouring boast that he would join the invaders with an army of more than twenty thousand men, and the geographical errors which place Harwich in Norfolk, and Portsmouth in Sussex, must certainly be attributed to the three foreigners, the originators of the conspiracy, and real fabricators of the letter. If we may believe the subsequent confessions of Ross and Barker, the instructions for Ridolphi were devised by Ross and Ridolphi; Barker was repeatedly sent by Ross to the duke with messages, both verbal and written, and to most of them the duke, probably that he might not compromise himself, returned no other answer than the unmeaning monosyllable *well*. The letter of credit appears to have been framed after this manner; for it reads more like a cento of scraps and patches than a continuous composition, and to have been moulded into its present shape in proportion as new intelligence was received from Barker. Whether it was ever communicated to the duke in its entirety, is unknown, that it was never subscribed by him, is certain. It has no signature, but a promise that the duke will avow the original to the Spanish ambassador. That he never made, or authorized any one to make, such an

[1] At the duke's trial it was maintained that he had authorized Ridolphi to declare to the pope and king of Spain that he was a Catholic. It is plain, however, from the manner in which the subject of religion is treated in both letters of credence, that the conspirators could not obtain his consent to that.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

avowal, he solemnly protested. It was, however, deposited, so we are told, with the ambassador, and consequently with its real authors. Who can prove that it did not even after that receive improvements, or that the Italian and Spanish versions left by Ridolphi in Rome and Madrid—the only copies which we possess—were correct representations of that which is called the original letter?

March 25.

With these credentials Ridolphi set out on his important mission. He waited first on the duke of Alva, of whose concurrence much doubt was entertained, both on account of his decided apathy during the last insurrection in the north, and the earnestness with which he now advocated a marriage between Mary Stuart and Don Juan of Austria, in opposition to that intended between her and the duke of Norfolk. Alva received the envoy courteously, listened with apparent interest to his proposals, and then returned this evasive answer, that he was ready to obey the orders of his sovereign the king of Spain. In reality he saw little prospect of success in the plan, and had formed a very contemptible notion of the agent, whom, in his despatches to Madrid, he denominated a babbling gossip.[1] Ridolphi, before his departure from Brussels, entrusted a parcel of letters to the care of Bailey, a Belgian, and sworn servant of Mary Stuart. Bailey was arrested at Dover, and found to have with him a bag of letters and a box of books belonging to the bishop of Ross. But the bishop was on the watch. With the connivance of the lord Cobham, warden of the Cinq ports, he contrived that the books should be sent

[1] Un gran parlanchin.—Memorias, 359. Apuntamientos, 111.

unopened to the council, but kept the bag himself, and had the letters deciphered in London by Cuthbert, his secretary. The most important was addressed to the duke of Norfolk, containing an account of Ridolphi's negotiation with Alva, and his hopes of success with the king of Spain. Aware of the probable consequences, Ross immediately sent his secretary for concealment to the house of the French ambassador,[1] and destroyed or secreted every dangerous paper in his possession. Bailey on the rack disclosed all that he knew: that the letters had been written by himself at the dictation of Ridolphi; that they contained accounts of Ridolphi's interviews with the duke of Alva, and of his intention to continue his mission, and that they were addressed to Mary Stuart, the bishop of Ross, and to two unknown English noblemen, designated in cipher by the numbers 30 and 40. Suspicion was now aroused. Ross was arrested; his house was searched; but his secretary had fled; his papers were found to be of the most innoxious description, and Ross himself very frankly owned that he had taken advantage of the journey of Ridolphi to request assistance for the Scottish friends of his sovereign from the duke of Alva and foreign princes; and that the two ciphers (which in reality represented the lord Lumley and the duke of Norfolk) stood for the Spanish ambassador and the queen of Scots. He was too well known to be implicitly believed; yet he succeeded; for the clue was now lost. Neither Mary Stuart nor the Spanish ambassador could be subjected to compulsory

[1] Cuthbert was secure there for a time; thence he was transferred to the house of the Spanish ambassador, and escaped to Flanders. —Apuntamientos, 118.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

examination. Ross was placed, however, in confinement with the bishop of Ely.[1]

From Brussels Ridolphi hastened to Rome, where his success was very indifferent. The pontiff (Pius V.) placed at his disposal a sum of money for the use of the parties, promised to recommend the enterprise to the favourable consideration of the king of Spain, and entrusted him with a letter to the duke of Norfolk, assuring that nobleman of his good-will, and regretting that circumstances rendered it impossible for him to afford more plentiful aid during the current year.

But it was on his reception at the court of Madrid that the issue of the enterprise depended. He reached that capital on the 3rd of July, and delivered his credentials to the secretary Zayas. The council of state was at a loss to understand them. Philip appointed a junto of six members to require explana-

July 6.

tions; and Ridolphi, in his answers to their interrogatories, entered into matters which probably had no other origin than the suggestions made by the three conspirators themselves in their private consultations. He stated that the Catholics[2] were resolved to get possession of the queen's person, and to put her to death; that the opportunity would be offered in some of her visits to private houses in the country; that one of those who offered to strike the blow was the marquess Vitelli;[3] that for the success of the enterprise

[1] See Lord Burghley's letter to Lord Shrewsbury of May 14; Lodge, ii. 54; Murdin, 36, 47, 100, 111, 118, 143, 169, 174; Fénélon, iv. 108, 112, 151; Camden, 235.

[2] See p. 198, note [1].

[3] Vitelli was a distinguished officer in the Spanish service, and the commissioner sent by Alva to treat respecting the restitution of the Spanish treasure. He was received most graciously by Elizabeth; but the insurrection soon afterwards broke out in the north, which rendered his stay in England an object of suspicion to Cecil.

they expected the aid of Philip, which might be afforded, without exciting suspicion, from the fleet which should conduct Alva from Flanders to Spain; that he was sure of the co-operation of the duke of Norfolk, of the earls of Worcester and Southampton of the lords Montague, Windsor, and Lumley, and several others; that Bacon, Cecil, Leicester, and Northampton were also marked out for destruction; and that there was no reason to fear for the safety of the queen of Scots during the insurrection, because the guard had been won over, and she had many Catholics about her.[1] A.D. 1571.

This statement, so improbable in itself, and so contradictory in several points to the credentials, did not dispel the doubts of the council. Philip was already possessed with the notion that Ridolphi might be an impostor in the pay of the English government;[2] and his perplexity was increased by the opposition between the letters of the pope and those from the duke of Alva. The pope most earnestly exhorted him not to forfeit this favourable opportunity of placing the rightful heir on the throne, and of restoring the ancient worship in England; the duke conjured him to take no part in an attempt devised by men without knowledge or experience, and made to depend upon promises which could never be performed. After much hesitation, Philip yielded to the August 4.

Many insults were offered to him, to drive him away; but he remained till the end of December, and then took his leave. He is frequently noticed by Fénélon in his despatches from October to the end of the year. Why Ridolphi should represent him as an assassin, does not appear.

[1] Memorias, vii. 358, 362, 441, 457. Apuntamientos, 112, 113.

[2] El creia que era todo invencion de Isabel para por este medio tener con que colorar su danada intension.—Philip to Espés in July, Memorias, 360.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571. authority of the pontiff and the advice of a portion of his council; he went so far as to form a plan of the enterprise, fixed on Vitelli as commander of the invading force, and replied in writing to the objections urged by the duke, but still left the final determination to his local knowledge and more mature experience. That Alva would at last have sacrificed his own opinion to the wish of his sovereign so clearly and decidedly expressed, is highly probable, but he was relieved from his embarrassment by an accident which had already taken place in England, and which led to the complete discovery of the whole intrigue.

Sept. 14.

About the middle of August, Barker and Higford, secretaries to the duke of Norfolk, entrusted a bag containing two thousand crowns (£600) to a person named Brown, a carrier from Shrewsbury, with orders to deliver it to Bannister, the duke's steward, living in the vicinity of Shrewsbury. The money came from the French ambassador, and was intended for the use of Queen Mary's garrison in the castle of Edinburgh. Brown, who was probably in the pay of the council, under pretence that there was something extraordinary in the weight of the bag, carried it to Lord Burghley.[1] The letters which accompanied the money showed its destination; all the persons connected with it were in the service of the duke of Norfolk; two circumstances which, coupled together, awakened and guided the suspicions of the council. Bannister, Barker, and Higford were apprehended and sent to the Tower. Bannister, the moment that he felt the rack, promised to answer every question; Barker, at the sight of it, disclosed the several messages which he had

[1] Camden, 235. Fénélon, iv. 226, 227.

taken to his lord from the bishop of Ross;[1] and Higford, with apparent willingness, not only communicated important information, but took the commissioners to the place where, instead of destroying, he had secreted several important documents. There, amidst a mass of papers, were found a letter to the duke from the pontiff; several from Mary Stuart to him as her affianced husband; and her letter to the bishop of Ross, which has been already noticed, approving of the mission of Ridolphi.[2] Norfolk, ignorant of these discoveries, assumed a bold front before the commissioners, denying most of the charges against him, and explaining away the others. The next day he was conveyed to the Tower by water, Sept. 7. whilst small bodies of gens d'armes scoured the streets to prevent any popular demonstration in his favour. There the depositions of his servants, and the papers which had been discovered, were laid before him. It was too late to dissemble. Abashed and confounded, he confessed that he had been made acquainted with several projects of discontented men for the surprisal of the queen, or the deliverance of

[1] "And they shall not seme to you to confess playnly ther knol-"ledg, than we warrant you to cause them both, or ether of them, "to be brought to the rack; and first to move them with feare "therof to deale playnly in ther answers, and if that shall not move "them, then you shall cause them to be putt to the rack, and to find "the tast therof untill they shall deale more playnly, or untill you "shall thynk mete." "Gyven under our signet the xvth of Sep-"tember, 1571."—Ellis, ii. 261, 262. Of his servants the duke says, in his letter of instruction to his children, after his condemnation: "Surely Bannister dealt no way but honestly and truly. Hick-"ford did not hurt me in my conscience willingly, nor did not charge "me with any great matter that was of weight, otherwise than truly, "but the bp. of Ross, and especially Barker, did falsely accuse me, "and laid their own treasons on my back. God forgive them!" January 20, 1572.—Tierney's Arundel, 367.

[2] See it p. 255.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

Mary Stuart; that he had conferred once with Ridolphi before the departure of that agent; and that he had corresponded with the Scottish queen in defiance of the royal prohibition, and breach of his own most solemn promise;[1] protesting, however, that the idea of injuring the person of the sovereign, or of subjugating the kingdom to a foreign prince, had never entered his mind.[2] The indignation of Elizabeth was roused to the highest pitch. She inveighed in the coarsest terms against the duke's presumption, and perfidy, and dissimulation, and committed the prosecution of the inquiry, without reserve, to Burghley and Burghley's party in the council. New examinations brought forth new disclosures; arrest followed upon arrest, and in a short time the earls of Arundel and Southampton, the lord Lumley, the lord Cobham and his brother, the two sons of the earl of Derby, and a multitude of gentlemen and persons of inferior rank, were committed to prison, or subjected to some of the milder forms of confinement then in use. In the Star-chamber the lord keeper explained with due exaggeration the presumed treasons of the duke to a numerous audience of noblemen, the lord mayor, and the aldermen; a similar statement was made to the citizens by the remembrancer; and printed copies of the same were circulated in profusion throughout the kingdom.

There was another individual as deeply implicated as the duke, and equally the object of vengeance,—the bishop of Ross. It was known that he would plead the privilege of an ambassador, in which quality he had come under a safe-conduct to Lon-

[1] See it in Haynes, 596.

[2] Camden, 236, 237. Murdin, i. 164. Anderson, iii. 149—157.

don, and had been acknowledged at the conferences respecting Mary Stuart. Ambassadors, he maintained, were privileged from arrest or punishment by the usage of every Christian country. If an ambassador gave offence or violated the law, he might be sent out of the dominions of the offended party, and there left to the judgment of the sovereign whose representative he had been. Time was taken to consult the most celebrated civilians in England and Germany. The answers from Germany were for the most part irrelevant or unsatisfactory; the English lawyers replied, that an ambassador exciting rebellion forfeits his privilege, and becomes subject to the judgment of the offended sovereign. Ross was now brought back from his confinement in Ely, and when he pleaded his privilege, was met with the answers of the crown lawyers. He began to argue; but Lord Burghley cut short the discussion by declaring that he must either answer, or go to the rack. He was immediately conveyed to the Tower, and a singular proclamation was issued, commanding every Scotsman to quit the kingdom within four days, under pain of imprisonment. In his cell the bishop received a message from the queen to make an entire confession for her use; it should neither do harm to him nor to any one else. Under this promise he gave a long answer to all the chief charges, but in such manner as on every point to vindicate or excuse the conduct of Mary Stuart, the duke of Norfolk, and himself.[1]

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

Oct. 10.

Oct. 25.

[1] Notwithstanding the queen's promise, he was asked to appear as a witness at the trial of the duke. He refused. It was then resolved to bring him to trial for his life, but he had the good fortune to escape, through the repeated intercession of the king of France. Two years elapsed before he could obtain his liberty (1573, November 18), and then only on condition that he should

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

These explanations were calculated to stimulate, instead of satisfying the queen's curiosity. She now required the duke "to search himself" and disclose to her the whole truth of his intrigue with the Scottish queen. He obeyed, and in his narrative of the proceedings introduced several particulars which appeared to shift great part of the blame from his shoulders to those of the royal favourite, the earl of Leicester.[1] It was Leicester who suggested to him the marriage with Mary; Leicester who wrote to that princess in favour of it; Leicester who promised to break the matter to Elizabeth, and to obtain her consent. Hitherto the chief hope of Norfolk rested on the advocacy of the earl; after the receipt of that narrative, Leicester appears to have abandoned him to his fate, if he did not even join his enemies against him.[2] Preparations were now made for his trial; an indictment for high treason was found against him at the sessions,[3] and, to prepare the public mind, care was taken that the pulpits should everywhere resound with invectives against Alva, the king of Spain, the pontiff, and the Catholic powers in general.

Nov. 10.

Nov. 28.

At length the queen appointed the earl of Shrewsbury lord high steward, that he might preside at the duke's trial, and gave to him for assessors six-and-twenty peers, all selected by the ministers, and including several who were known enemies of the prisoner.[4]

never more set his foot on English ground. He retired to France. —See Camden, 237; Fénélon, iv. 266; v. 392, 451; Digges, 151.

[1] See his narrative in Murdin, dated November 10.

[2] Fénélon says that Leicester was so offended, que la, ou auparavant il monstroit de luy estre amy, il semble a ceste heure, qu'il luy veuille estre bien fort contraire; ce qui luy pourra beaucoup nuire.—Fénélon, iv. 292.

[3] Id. p. 295.

[4] A few days before, Berners and Mather were apprehended at

Of that, however, he could not complain, for the jurisprudence of the age repudiated the notion, that on such grave and solemn occasions noble peers could possibly be influenced by their prejudices or antipathies. Before this court Norfolk was charged with the crime of imagining and compassing the death of his own sovereign,—1. By seeking to marry the queen of Scots, who claimed the English crown to the exclusion of Elizabeth. 2. By soliciting foreign powers to invade the realm through the agency of Ridolphi. 3. By sending money to the English rebels and the Scottish enemies of the queen. The duke maintained his innocence on every count. The queen of Scots was not the competitor of his sovereign. As soon as she became her own mistress, she laid aside the title of queen of England, and repeatedly offered to renounce it in the most ample form, if Elizabeth would acknowledge her undoubted claim to the succession. 1. He had never spoken with Ridolphi but once; and then he understood that the sole object of the Italian's mission was to procure aid for the Scottish subjects of the Scottish queen. 2. He had

1572. Jan. 16.

the instance of Herle, their associate. From their several examinations it appears that all three were discontented men, who complained that under the existing government nothing could be obtained by any others than "dancers and carpet knights;" men such as Leicester and Hatton, who were "admitted to the queen's "privy chamber." They had often conversed on the means by which the duke of Norfolk might be liberated, on the murder of his enemy the lord Burghley, and on the preferment to be expected under a new sovereign. But there appears no trace of any plot for the actual execution of such purposes. Mather said the death of Burghley had been proposed to him by the Spanish ambassador. It was denied, and subsequently recalled by himself. Berners and Mather suffered; Herle saved his life by becoming informer; though Mather told him that, if another hour had passed, he himself meant to have informed against Herle and Berners.—Murdin, 194—210. Digges, 165. Camden, 254.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

never sent money to the English rebels; and, though he had allowed his servant to take the charge of a sum of money for the lord Herries, he conceived that he had done no wrong; for Herries was the devoted servant of Mary, and Mary the acknowledged ally of Elizabeth. On all these points he spoke with temper, decision, and eloquence.[1]

The history of this trial will show how difficult it was, according to the jurisprudence of the age, for any prisoner to escape conviction under a prosecution by the crown. The duke of Norfolk had been a close prisoner in the Tower during eighteen weeks. He had been deprived of the use of books, and debarred from all communication with his friends. He received notice of trial only the evening before his arraignment. He was kept in ignorance of the charges against him till he heard the indictment from the bar. He was refused the aid of counsel to suggest advice, or to unravel the sophistry of the crown lawyers. *They* came to the cause with the subjects of discussion prepared and digested; with a voluminous mass of papers, and with notes to aid their memory; he was called to answer, without preparation, to numerous circumstances of persons, places, conversations, and dates, which ran through the space of the three last years. The evidence against him consisted partly of letters, but principally of confessions extorted from the other prisoners, by the pain of the rack, or the hope of life.[2] Of these confessions only such passages

[1] Howell's State Trials, i. 957—1042. Camden, 245—254. Sadler, ii. 341.

[2] At the trial the confessions were represented as made voluntarily. Yet, on September 15, the queen, in the handwriting of Burghley, ordered the prisoners "to be put to the rack, and find "the taste thereof;" and Sir Thomas Smyth, in a letter of Sep-

as bore against the prisoner were made public; whatever might furnish a presumption in his favour, or throw discredit on the witnesses (and there is much of this description in the original papers), was carefully suppressed. But of that suppression the prisoner was kept in ignorance; and, when he maintained that credit was not due to men whose interest it was to accuse *him* that they might save their own lives, he was told that the deponents had sworn to the truth of their answers, and that his bare denial was of no weight in opposition to their oaths. He then demanded that they should be confronted with him; and appealed to the protection granted to prisoners by the statute of Edward VI.; but it was replied that that statute "had been found too hard and dangerous "for the prince, and therefore had been repealed." When the court was about to withdraw and deliberate on their judgment, a message was delivered from the

tember 17, says, "I suppose we have gotten so mych at this "time as is lyke to be had; yet to-morrow we do intend to bryng "a couple of them to the rack, not in any hope to get any thyng "worthy that payne or feare, but because it is so earnestly com-"mandid unto us;" and, September 20, "of Banister with the "rack, of Barker with the extreme feare of it, we suppose to have "gotten all."—Ellis, ii. 261. Murdin, 95, 101. To prevail on the bishop of Ross to confess, he was promised that his depositions should not be employed against any man; they were required merely to satisfy the queen's own mind; but it was added that if he refused, he should be most certainly executed.—Anderson, iii. 199, 200, 202. Just before the trial, the master of the requests came up and required him to be present at the proceedings; he refused, saying, "I never conferred with the duke myself, on any of these "matters, but only by his servants, nor yet heard him speak one "word at any time against his duty to his prince or country; and "if I shall be forced to be present, I will publicly profess before "the whole nobility, that he never opened his mouth maliciously or "traitorously against the queen or the realm."—Ibid. 229, 230. This design was therefore abandoned; but great use was made of the confessions of the bishop, contrary to the previous promise.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

queen, that she had received full confirmation of the treason from a foreign ambassador;[1] but that, as it would be imprudent to disclose it in public, the peers might learn the particulars from their colleagues of the council in private. They retired, the new evidence was laid before them; there cannot be a doubt that in such peculiar circumstances it would make impression on many minds; yet it could be of no value, for it amounted only to hearsay, and was kept secret from the prisoner. After an hour spent in consultation, an unanimous verdict of guilty was returned. As soon as judgment had been pronounced, the duke with a firm voice and undaunted countenance replied, "This, my lords, is the judgment of a "traitor; but I shall die as true a man to the queen "as any liveth. I will not desire you to petition for "my life; you have put me out of your company, "and I trust shortly to be in better company in "heaven. I only beg that the queen's majesty will "be good to my orphan children, and take orders for "the payment of my debts. God doth know how "true a heart I bear to her and my country, whatsoever "has been this day objected to me. Fare ye well, my "lords."[2]

[1] But who was this ambassador? The envoy to the duke of Alva at Antwerp, from Cosmo de Medici, grand duke of Florence. This man had learned the whole history of Ridolphi's mission from one to whom Ridolphi had disclosed it in confidence. Without loss of time he communicated the intelligence to the duke his sovereign, who forwarded his despatches to Queen Elizabeth. So it appears from the account of the Spanish ambassador.—See Gonzales, Apuntamientos, p. 128.

[2] State Trials, i. 1032. Camd. 246—254. Mr. Jardine very justly observes that the first and third charge did not amount to treason; and that on the second, though there existed strong ground for suspicion, no proof was produced sufficient to convict the accused (p. 243).

appointed commissioners to lay her complaints before the Scottish queen, who replied, under protest to save her independence, that, if she had consented to marry the duke, it had been without any hostile meaning towards her good sister; that her correspondence with Ridolphi had been strictly confined to pecuniary transactions; that from foreign powers she had never solicited anything more than aid for her faithful subjects in Scotland, and that she had not been privy in any manner to the bull of deposition, or to the northern rebellion.[1] CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572. June 17.

Whatever Elizabeth might think of these answers, the execution of the duke, and the proceedings in parliament, disheartened the friends of Mary in England, while, at the same time, her interest was rapidly declining in her native country. Lennox, the regent, had exercised his authority with rigour; execution after execution alarmed the friends of the queen; and the unexpected surprisal of the strong fortress of Dumbarton threw into his hands the most active of Mary's partisans, John Hamilton, brother of the duke of Chastelherault, archbishop of St. Andrew's, and formerly papal legate in Scotland. The prisoner was hurried away to Stirling and hanged on a gibbet at the market cross. By the more moderate of the party this murder was condemned as a foul act of family vengeance. To lessen the odium, Lord Ruthven had previously accused the prelate of having been accessory to the murder of Darnley; but, though he denied the charge, and claimed the benefit of a legal trial, no respite was granted to him, because his enemies feared that a reclamation would be made in his favour by the 1571. April 2.

[1] The complaints or charges are in Murdin, 218; the answers in Camden, 260; Lettres de Marie, iv. 48—56.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1571.

queen of England. His fate did not, however, break the spirit of Kirkaldy, who refused to admit the regent within the walls of Edinburgh, and by repeated assaults compelled him and his adherents, whom he had summoned to hold a parliament in the suburbs, to withdraw to Stirling. There Lennox opened the session with a long harangue, in presence of the young king,[1] and passed an act of forfeiture against the duke and his two sons, and against the earl of Huntley,

Sept. 2.

Kirkaldy, and several others; but on the eighth day, at an early hour in the morning, Huntley, Claude Hamilton, and Scot of Buccleugh, appeared with four hundred horse before the gate of the town. "Remember the archbishop," was the word given to the soldiers. In a few minutes all the lords were in the hands of the assailants. Lennox paid the forfeit of his life; the others were rescued by the timely arrival of the earl of Marr, whom, in reward for his services,

1572. Sept. 6.

they invested with the regency. His prudence and vigour rendered him a formidable antagonist; Elizabeth declared openly her intention to support him with the whole power of her crown; and the avowed adherents of Mary dwindled away to a handful of brave and resolute men, who, under Kirkaldy, still kept for her the castle of Edinburgh, and a band of Highlanders, who, commanded by Sir Adam Gordon, maintained the ascendancy of her cause in the mountains.[2]

[1] "During the regent's speiche to the estaits, the king looked "upe, and espayed a hole in the rouffe of the housse, by the laicke "of some sklaitts, and after the regent had endit his harrang, he "said, 'I think there is ane hole in this parliament.'" These words were afterwards taken for a prediction of the death of Lennox. —Balfour, i. 351.

[2] Robertson, App. 2, No. iv. Bannatyne, 120, 154, 256. Act Parl. iii. 58. Camden, 227, 240.

To add to the sorrows of the captive queen, the executions of the duke of Norfolk in England, and of the archbishop of St. Andrew's in Scotland, were followed by that of her devoted adherent the earl of Northumberland. The English queen came forward to bid against the countess for the possession of the prisoner. She offered an equal sum of money, and Marr the regent, with the earl of Morton, hesitated not to violate the pledge given to an exiled woman, that he might gratify his powerful neighbour. This determination, however, was kept a secret from the earl. He left Lochlevin with joy under the assurance that he should be conveyed in a Scottish vessel to Antwerp. To his surprise and dismay he found himself, after a short voyage, at Coldingham. On the same day the money, the price of his blood, was numbered and sealed at Berwick; and Lord Hunsdon, taking with him the bag of gold, exchanged it for Northumberland at Ayemouth. Numerous interrogatories were sent from London, to which he returned answers; but when Hunsdon was ordered to take him for execution to York, that nobleman, who looked on the whole transaction as disgraceful, refused, and the unwelcome task was transferred to Sir John Foster, who possessed the earl's estates in Northumberland. At York he was beheaded without trial, in virtue of the act of attainder. On the scaffold he refused the aid of the clergyman, professed himself a Catholic, and declared that he had satisfactorily replied to every charge against him, in his answers to the council.[1]

August 22.

[1] See Bridgewater's Concertatio, 46—49; Camden, 269. The interrogatories are in Murdin, 219; the earl's answers in Sharp's Memorials of the Rebellion.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

The English cabinet, amid the alarms with which it was continually perplexed, rested with much confidence on the treaty lately concluded with France. To cultivate the friendship between the two crowns, Elizabeth had been advised to listen to a new proposal of marriage, not with her first suitor, the duke of Jan. 17. Anjou, but with his younger brother, the duke of Alençon. The former was the leader of the Catholic party; the latter was thought to incline to the tenets of Protestantism. There were, indeed, two almost insuperable objections; the disparity of age, for the duke was twenty-one years younger than the queen; and the want of attraction in a face which had suffered severely from the small-pox, and was disfigured by an extraordinary enlargement of the nose.[1] Still Elizabeth, with her usual irresolution, entertained the project; and her ministers, supported by the French Protestants, urged its acceptance.[2] But their hopes were unexpectedly checked by an event which struck with astonishment all the nations of Europe, and which cannot be contemplated without horror at the present day. The reader has already seen that the ambition of the French princes had marshalled, in hostile array, the professors of the old and new doctrines against each other. In the contests which

[1] François d'Alençon fut extremement defiguré par la petite vérole. Son nez bourgeonné devint hideux sur la fin de ses jours. En raison de sa grosseur, il sembloit qu'il en eut deux greffés l'un sur l'autre. Ces deux nez (Le Laboureur, i. 702) tomberent de pourriture. When he went to Flanders these verses were made.

"Flamands, ne soyez etonnez,
Si à François voyez deux nez.
Car par droit, raison et usage,
Faut deux nez à double visage."

Observ. sur les Mém. de Henri, duc de Bouillon, tom. xlvii. p. 459.

[2] Digges, 164, 195, 220, 229, 232. Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 7.

followed, the influence of religious animosity was added to those passions which ordinarily embitter domestic warfare.[1] The most solemn compacts were often broken; outrages the most barbarous were reciprocally perpetrated without remorse; murder was retaliated with murder, massacre with massacre. The king, by the last edict of pacification, had indeed sheathed the swords of the two parties; but he had not obliterated the sense of former wrongs, nor appeased the desire of revenge which still rankled in their breasts. They continued to view each other with aversion and distrust, watchful to anticipate the designs which they attributed to their opponents, and eager, at the first provocation, real or supposed, to free themselves from their enemies.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

The young king of Navarre was the nominal, the admiral Coligny the real, leader of the Huguenots. He ruled among them as an independent sovereign; and, what chiefly alarmed his opponents, seemed to obtain gradually the ascendancy over the mind of Charles. He had come to Paris to assist at the marriage of the king of Navarre, and was wounded in two places by an assassin as he passed through the streets. The public voice attributed the attempt to the duke of Guise, in revenge of the murder of his father at the siege of Orleans; it had proceeded, in reality (and was so suspected by Coligny himself), from Catherine, the queen mother. The wounds were not dangerous; but the Huguenot chieftains crowded to his hotel; their threats of vengeance terrified the queen; and in a secret council the king was persuaded to anticipate

August 22.

[1] Ce beau manteau de religion, qui a servi aux uns et aux autres pour exécuter leurs vengeances, et nous faire entremanger.—Montluc, Mém. xxvi. 86.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572. August 24.

the bloody and traitorous designs attributed to the friends of the admiral. The next morning, by the royal order, the hotel was forced; Coligny and his principal counsellors perished; the populace joined in the work of blood; and every Huguenot, or suspected Huguenot, who fell in their way, was murdered. Several days elapsed before order was finally restored in the capital; in the provinces the governors, though instructed to prevent similar excesses, had not always the power or the will to check the fury of the people, and the massacre of Paris was imitated in several towns, principally those in which the passions of the inhabitants were inflamed by the recollection of the barbarities exercised amongst them by the Huguenots during the late wars.[1]

This bloody tragedy had been planned and executed in Paris with so much expedition, that its authors had not determined on what ground to justify or palliate their conduct. In the letters written the same evening to the governors of the provinces, and to the ambassadors of foreign courts, it was attributed to the ancient quarrel and insatiate hatred which existed between the princes of Lorrain and the house of Coligny.[2] But, as the duke of Guise refused to take the infamy on himself, the king was obliged to acknowledge in parliament that he had signed the order for the death of the admiral, and sent in consequence to his ambassadors new and more detailed instructions.

August 26.

[1] See note (M).

[2] Digges, 264. Ceulx de la maison de Guise, et les aultres seigneurs et gentils hommes, qui leur adherent, ayan tscu certainment, que les amis dudit admiral vouloient poursuivre sur eulx la vengeance de ceste blessure pour les soupçonner, à ceste cause et occasion se sont si fort esmus ceste nuit passé, &c.—Letter to Joyeuse, apud Caveirac, xxxii.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572. Sept. 9.

In a long audience, La Motte Fénélon assured Elizabeth that Charles had conceived no idea of such an event before the preceding evening, when he learned, with alarm and astonishment, that the confidential advisers of the admiral had formed a plan to revenge the attempt made on his life, by surprising the Louvre, making prisoners of the king and the royal family, and putting to death the duke of Guise and the leaders of the Catholics; that the plot was revealed to one of the council, whose conscience revolted from such a crime; that his deposition was confirmed in the mind of the king, by the violent and undutiful expressions uttered by Coligny in the royal presence; that, having but the interval of a few hours to deliberate, he had hastily given permission to the duke of Guise and his friends to execute justice on his and their enemies; and that if, from the excited passions of the populace, some innocent persons had perished with the guilty, it had been done contrary to his intention, and had given him the most heartfelt sorrow. The insinuating eloquence of Fénélon made an impression on the mind of Elizabeth; she ordered her ambassador to thank Charles for the communication; trusted that he would be able to satisfy the world of the uprightness of his intention; and recommended to his protection the persons and worship of the French Protestants. To the last point Catherine shrewdly replied that her son could not follow a better example than that of his good sister the queen of England; that, like her, he would force no man's conscience; but, like her, he would prohibit in his dominions the exercise of every other worship besides that which he practised himself.[1]

[1] Digges, 244, 246.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

The news of this sanguinary transaction, exaggerated as it was by the imagination of the narrators and the arts of politicians, excited throughout England one general feeling of horror. It served to confirm, in the minds of the Protestants, the reports so industriously spread, of a Catholic conspiracy for their destruction; and it gave additional weight to the arguments of Burghley and the other enemies of the queen of Scots. They admonished Elizabeth to provide for her own security; the French Protestants had been massacred; her deposition or murder would follow. If she tendered her own life, the weal of the realm, or the interest of religion, let her disappoint the malice of her enemies by putting to death her rival, and *their* ally, Mary Stuart.[1] The queen did not reject the advice; but, that she might escape the infamy of dipping her hands in the blood of her nearest relative and presumptive heir, Killegrew was despatched to Edinburgh, ostensibly to compose the difference between the regent Morton on the one part, and the earl of Huntley on the other, respecting the terms of an armistice which had been lately concluded between them; but, under that cover, to call the attention of the Protestant lords to the late massacres in France, to inform them that the queen was afraid, or rather all but certain, that these had been premeditated, in consequence of the league said to exist among the Catholic powers for the extirpation of the reformed creed; to exhort them on that account to look well to themselves, to take care that none among them were

Sept. 7.

[1] The death of Mary was advised on the 5th of September, by Sandys, bishop of London. "Furthwith to cutte off the Scottish "quene's heade: ipsa est nostri fundi calamitas."—Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 25.

seduced by bribes, none made away with by poison, and none prevailed upon to convey the young prince out of the realm; and lastly to promise in her name that, if any attempt were made against them, the queen would defend Scotland with as much care as if it were her own inheritance.[1] From these instructions Killegrew might infer that it would be his duty to excite the apprehensions and alarm the religious prejudices of the Scottish reformers; but for what purpose? That he was not yet permitted to know. Three days later other instructions informed him that Sept. 10. he was employed "on a matter of farr greter moment, "wherein all secrecy and circumspection was to be "used." That matter was to bring about the death of the queen of Scots, but from the hands of her own subjects. He was, however, warned not to commit his sovereign, as if the proposal came from her. He was first to ascertain the disposition of Morton and the other lords; to earn the confidence of those whom he found most apt; to lament before them that Mary was not where she might be justly executed for her crimes; and to work on their hopes and fears, till he should draw from them some expression which might lead him to suggest the object of his mission, but as of himself, and merely as a passing thought. If it were

[1] See Arch. xx. 326. It is amusing to observe the caution with which these despatches are worded. Though the envoy is to persuade the Scottish lords that the massacre was premeditated, and a consequence of the league for the extirpation of the reformed faith, he is not ordered, but only permitted ("you may"), to say:— 1. Not that the queen knows, but "is afraid and *in a manner* per- "fectly doth see it." 2. Not that there actually exists any such league, but that "it is said" to exist. It is plain from this document that the queen's government had no proof of the supposed league or supposed premeditation, but that they found it convenient to take both as admitted facts.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572. —

entertained, he was then authorized to negotiate a treaty on the following basis; that Elizabeth should deliver Mary to the king's lords, "to receave that she "had deserved ther by ordre of justice;" and that they should deliver their children, or nearest kinsmen, to Elizabeth, as securities, "that no furder perill "should ensue by hir escapying, or setting hyr up "agen; for otherwise to have hir and to keep hir was "over all other things the most dangerous."[1]

Such was the delicate and important trust confided to the fidelity and dexterity of Killegrew. In Morton he found a willing coadjutor; of Marr the regent it has been said that he was too honest a man to pander to the jealousies or resentments of the English queen, and resolutely turned a deaf ear to the hints and suggestion of the envoy. Recent discoveries have, however, proved that, if at the first he affected to look upon the project as attended with difficulty and peril,

Oct. 19.

he afterwards entered into it most cordially, and sought to drive a profitable bargain with Elizabeth. By the abbot of Dunfermline he required that she should take the young James under her protection, and conclude a defensive league with Scotland; that an English army of two or three thousand men should conduct the captive queen across the borders, and after her death, should join with the Scots in the siege of the castle of Edinburgh; and that the arrears of pay due to the Scottish forces should be discharged by the queen of England. On these terms he was willing to engage that Mary Stuart should not live four hours after she should arrive in Scotland. But the regent himself hardly lived four days after he had made these

[1] Murdin, 224.

proposals.[1] He died after a short illness at Stirling, and as his friends gave out, of poison.[2] CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

At the election of the next regent, Killegrew employed the English interest in favour of Morton, the most determined enemy of Mary, and the tried friend of the English ministers.[3] From the moment he was chosen, he made it his chief object to bring about a pacification between the rival parties in Scotland. The Hamiltons and Gordons with their associates were restored to their lands and honours, as faithful subjects of the young king, with a secret understanding that all inquiries into the murder of Darnley, and prosecutions on that account, should be suspended—a measure as necessary for the protection of the regent himself, as for any other individual. Killegrew did not forget the great matter for which he had been sent into Scotland; but now to his hints Morton could reply, that to execute Mary on account of the murder would be to unsettle all that he had so happily accomplished. The lords in the castle of Edinburgh refused to subscribe the articles, which had been accepted by their friends; the regent applied for aid to Elizabeth;

Oct. 8.

Nov. 9.

Nov. 24.

1573. Feb. 23.

[1] These particulars have been discovered by Mr. Tytler in the official correspondence, partly in the State Paper Office, and partly in the British Museum.—Tytler, vii. 313, 384. It appears to me that the queen's consent to this project was extorted from her by the representations of Burghley and Leicester. She was plainly ashamed of it. She told them and Killegrew that, as they were the only persons privy to it, if it ever became known, they should answer for having betrayed the secret; and Burghley, the moment he received intelligence of the regent's death, wrote to Leicester: "I now see the queen's majesty has no surety but as she hath been "counselled" (the private execution of Mary Stuart). "If her "majesty will continue her delays, she and we shall vainly call "upon God when calamity shall fall upon us." He then complains again of her delays.—Tytler, vii. 324.

[2] Bannatyne, 4, 11.

[3] Curante in primis Elizabetha suffectus erat.—Camden, 278.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1573. — April 25. and she, after much angry expostulation and many delays, gave her consent. In spring, Drury, marshal of Berwick, arrived in the port of Leith with an English army and a battering train, to enforce submission. It was in vain that the besieged by a messenger, and Mary by her ambassador, solicited aid in men and money from the French king. Charles replied that circumstances compelled him to refuse the request. Should he grant it, Elizabeth would immediately send a fleet to the relief of La Rochelle.[1]

June 9. After a siege of thirty-four days, the castle was surrendered, not to Morton, but to Drury and the queen of England, on condition that the fate of the prisoners should be at her disposal.[2] In a few days Maitland died of poison, whether it was administered to him by order of Morton, as the queen of Scots asserts,[3] or had been taken by himself to elude the malice of his August 3. enemies. His gallant associate Kirkaldy suffered soon afterwards the punishment of a traitor.[4] The latter was esteemed the best soldier, the former the most able statesman, in Scotland; but both, according to the fashion of the age, had repeatedly veered from one party to the other, without regard to honesty or loyalty; and Maitland had been justly attainted by parliament as an accomplice in the murder of Darnley.[5]

[1] Melville, 119, 120. Murdin, 244, 246—254.

[2] "If they be not executed, at least the chiefest of them, I, for "my part, must think and say that it will greatly hinder her "majesty's service."—Killegrew to Burghley, June 13. Wright, i. 484.

[3] Mary's letter in Blackwood, apud Jebb, ii. 268.

[4] One hundred persons of the family of Kirkaldy, to save the life of their chieftain, offered to Morton twenty thousand pounds Scots, an annuity of three thousand marks, and their services as his retainers for life.—Camden, 282.

[5] Maitland, after his attainder, complained, in a letter to the laird of Carmichael, that the sentence had been procured by Mor-

CHAP. IV.

The late massacre in France had caused many of the Protestants to cross the eastern frontier into Germany and Switzerland; others, from the western coast, had sought an asylum in England; while the inhabitants of Poitou and the neighbouring provinces poured with their ministers into La Rochelle. The place, strong by nature, was still more strengthened by art. The enthusiasm of the townsmen taught them to despise the efforts of the besiegers under the duke of Anjou; but their chief reliance was on the fleet, which the count of Montgomery had collected in the harbours of Plymouth and Falmouth, and on the promises of aid which that nobleman had received from the English council. Charles indulged a hope that he might deprive them of this resource. At his request, and in opposition to the advice of her ministers, Elizabeth consented to become godmother to his infant daughter, and sent the earl of Worcester to present a font of gold, and to answer in her name at the baptism. This, in the estimation of the French reformers, was an act of apostasy; their fanaticism urged them to intercept the English squadron; and, in the action which followed, some of the ambassador's attendants were slain, one of his ships was taken and plundered, and he himself was put in jeopardy of his life. The French court improved the opportunity to despatch to England the marshal de Retz, before the queen's irritation had time to cool. He attempted to justify

A.D. 1573. Feb. 25.

ton, "for a crime, whereof," says the ex-secretary, "he knows in "his conscience that I was as innocent as himself." Morton replies,—"that I know him innocent in my conscience as myself! "The contrary thereof is true. For I was and am innocent thereof; "but I could not affirm the same of him, considering what I under-"stand of that matter of his own confession, before, to myself."—Dalzell, 474—480. The truth is, both were guilty.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1573. the conduct of Charles in the late massacre, and is said to have drawn from her an acknowledgment that Coligny had deserved his fate, though it ought not to have involved so many of his followers; and to have obtained a promise that she would refuse a loan of money to the envoys of the Rochellois, under the pretence that she had already refused a similar request made by the king. But when he proceeded to demand that the hostile fleet collected at Plymouth should be dispersed, she referred him to her ministers, who replied, that Englishmen had a right to traffic where they pleased; and that, if they abused that right for other purposes, they might be treated as pirates by the prince whom they had offended. This evasion furnished a sufficient proof of the connection between the council and the insurgents.[1]

April 19. Montgomery sailed; was terrified at the sight of the French fleet, moored under the protection of forts and batteries; and, after a useless cruise of a few days, returned to England. His failure made the queen repent that she had not acceded to the request of Gondi. She acquainted Montgomery with her displeasure, that he had presumed to unfurl the English flag, and forbade him to anchor in the English ports. 1574. June 26. The next year he was made prisoner in Normandy, and suffered in Paris the death of a traitor.[2]

1573. May 9. La Rochelle, however, was saved by the heroism of its inhabitants, and the impatience of Anjou to take possession of the throne of Poland, to which he had June 24. been elected by the national diet. Favourable terms July 6. were granted to the besieged, and a new edict of

[1] Camden, 275. Castelnau, tom. xlvi. 55. Thuan. iii. 244. Mém. de l'estat, ii. 131; ii. 300, 301.

[2] Camden, 276. Daniel, x. 517.

pacification held out to France the promise of a respite from civil and religious war; but the prospect was soon darkened by a confederacy formed between the leaders of the Huguenots and the marshals de Montmorency, de Cossé, and Damfont, the Catholic leaders of the party called the Politicians. Both factions made it their common object to seize the person of the king, whose health was rapidly declining; to remove the queen-mother and the duke of Guise from the royal councils, and to proclaim Alençon the next heir to the crown, in place of his brother in Poland. But the conspiracy was detected and defeated by the vigilance and the decision of Catherine; the inferior agents suffered on the scaffold; Montmorency and Cossé were committed to the Bastile; and the duke and the king of Navarre were so narrowly watched at court, that four attempts to effect their escape failed of success. In all these intrigues, the English ambassador acted an important, though clandestine part, encouraging the malcontents with the hope of succour from England, and advising Alençon, in the name of his sovereign, to put himself at the head of the movement.[1]

A.D. 1573.

1574. Feb. 24.

April 10.

In a few days Charles IX. died of a pulmonary complaint. Catherine, whom he had appointed regent, preserved the crown for her second son, the king of Poland; but she was unable to prevent the factious proceedings of the malcontents in the provinces. The Huguenots bound themselves by a solemn engagement to each other, and established a council at

May 30.

[1] Murdin, 775. Camden, 289, 290. Daniel, x. 539. The queen was reminded "that the duk of Alanzon was brought to be "awtor of troubles in his oun countrye by her majestie's means."—Murdin, 338.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1574. Millaud in Rovergue, with power to appoint counsellors and commanders, to determine the quota of men and money to be raised in each district, and to act as an independent authority in the heart of France. Damville, the ostensible leader of the Politicians, assembled the states of his government of Languedoc, August 9. and concluded a treaty of mutual defence with the council of Millaud. In these favourable circumstances, the duke of Alençon, having at last effected 1575. Sept. 15. his escape, raised the standard of revolt; and Elizabeth, though she had renewed the treaty of Blois (a treaty offensive and defensive between the two crowns), advanced a considerable sum to raise an army of German Protestants for his service. It was not long 1576. Feb. 3. before the king of Navarre also eluded the vigilance of his guards; and the two princes jointly solicited the queen of England to declare publicly in their favour. The question of war was seriously debated in the English cabinet; but the friends of peace formed the majority; and Elizabeth offered herself as mediatrix between the king of France and his revolted subjects. Her efforts were seconded by the duke, who had grown jealous of the superior influ- May 9. ence of the king of Navarre; and a treaty was concluded, by which the public exercise of the reformed worship was permitted with a few restrictions; an assembly of the states was promised for the future regulation of the kingdom; and Alençon obtained the appanage which had been enjoyed by his elder brother, and from that period assumed the title of duke of Anjou.[1]

The calm produced by this treaty was of short

[1] Davila, 393. Lodge, ii. 135, 142. Murdin, 288, 289, 776, 778. Camden, 303.

duration. The confederacy of the Protestants at Millaud provoked, as was to be expected, on the part of the Catholics, similar but opposite associations in almost every province. The subscribers bound themselves to maintain the ascendancy of the ancient faith, and to protect, at the hazard of their lives and fortunes, the Catholic worship, the clergy, and the churches, against the hostile attempts of their enemies.[1] To Henry all these associations appeared encroachments on the royal prerogative; he viewed them with alarm; but his efforts to arrest their progress were useless; and the project of uniting all the Catholic associations into one general confederacy reduced him to the necessity of either joining one or other of the contending parties, or of remaining a king without consideration or authority. He placed his name at the head of the Catholic league; the majority of the deputies to the assembly of the states subscribed after him, and, at their petition, most of the privileges granted to the Protestants by the last edict were annulled. Another religious war ensued; it was terminated, as usual, by a short-lived peace; and the Protestants ultimately recovered the chief of those concessions which had been revoked.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1576. — 1577. February. Jan. 1. Oct. 5.

But it is now time that the reader should cast his eyes across the northern frontier of France, and survey the convulsed state of the Netherlands. The reader will recollect the seizure by Elizabeth of the money destined for the pay of the army under the duke of Alva. That unfriendly measure had been productive of more important consequences than its advisers could have dared to expect. The Spanish

[1] See it in Daniel, xi. 62.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1577.

soldiers, without pay, lived at free quarters on the inhabitants. The duke, to raise money, required the imposition of new taxes; and, on the refusal of the states, he published an edict, imposing them by his own authority as representative of the king. This arbitrary act, subversive of the most valuable rights of the nation, filled up, in the estimation of the Flemish people, the measure of their grievances. They closed their shops; the usual transactions of trade were interrupted; the markets remained empty; and in the most populous towns a general gloom prevailed, indicative of the discontent of the inhabitants, and ominous of subsequent calamities.[1]

A number of small vessels had been successively equipped by the Belgian malcontents, to cruise against the trade of Spain. Their commanders received commissions from the prince of Orange, and obeyed the immediate orders of the count of La Marque, who had fixed his head-quarters at Dover, and thence directed the operations of the fleet. At length Elizabeth, either at the remonstrance of Philip, or in connivance with La Marque, ordered that officer to quit her dominions.[2] He sailed to the island of Horn, surprised the fortress of Brille, and planted on its walls the standard of Belgian independence. His success encouraged the inhabitants of Flushing to expel the Spanish garrison, and to solicit aid both from the French Protestants and the English council. The former sent them a large body of men; the latter supplied them with ten thousand pounds, and permitted Thomas Morgan to take with him three hundred volunteers, who were soon followed by nine

1572. Feb. 21.

April 1.

[1] Bentivoglio, 92. Strada, l. vii. anno 1570.
[2] Murdin, 210.

companies of foot, under Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and a considerable supply of ammunition and cannon. Encouraged by the presence of these foreigners, many of the towns in Holland and Zeeland threw off the Spanish yoke.[1] CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

This insurrection, and the advice of the admiral Coligny during the pacification of France, had induced the prince of Orange to make another attempt to drive the Spaniards out of the Netherlands. His brother Louis, with the aid of the French Huguenots, surprised and garrisoned Mons, the capital of Hainault. Alva sat down before it with his army; and the prince led twenty thousand Frenchmen and Germans to raise the siege. Mons, however, surrendered; but Orange succeeded in penetrating as far as Enchuysen, where he was received with applause by the inhabitants of Holland and Zeeland, and appointed stadtholder of the two provinces.[2] September

The reader will have observed much inconsistency in the transactions of the English government with the kings of France and Spain. It arose from the different opinions entertained by the queen and the counsellors whom she principally trusted. *Their* chief object was the ascendancy of the Protestant cause in the Catholic kingdoms. For this purpose they maintained a constant correspondence with the chiefs of the Protestant insurgents, and sought to render them independent of their respective sovereigns, both in the Netherlands and France. But Elizabeth was a sovereign herself; though she approved of the object, she deemed it a duty to uphold the rights and prerogatives of thrones, and feared that

[1] Bentivoglio, 102, 106.
[2] Ibid. 110—124. Strada, l. vii.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1572.

the precedent of successful rebellion might one day be retorted against herself. Hence each vicissitude of fortune experienced by the insurgents abroad produced a change of measures in the queen's council at home. Sometimes she was induced to sacrifice her feelings to the representations of her ministers; often she compelled the ministers to submit to her will in opposition to their own judgment.

From the moment that the prince of Orange assumed the government of Holland and Zeeland, Elizabeth began to view his designs with jealousy and distrust. She was aware that his private interests, and his intimate connection with the Huguenots, would induce him to seek aid from France; she believed that Henry III. would grasp at the opportunity of an expedition into the Netherlands, as an expedient to establish tranquillity within his own dominions; and she dreaded the annexation of the seventeen provinces to France, as pregnant with danger to the commerce and independence of England. Indications were given of a partiality to the cause of Spain; the English forces were recalled from Flushing,[1] and Guaras, the envoy of Alva, was admitted to treat with the lord treasurer.[2] These ministers, after some debate, declared that the ancient friendship between the two crowns, though it had

Nov. 24. 1573. May 1.

[1] It would appear that Flushing was as unhealthy then as of late years. "All our men be come from Flushing, either before, or at, "or since their returning, the most part all sick."—Digges, 299.

[2] One of the most irritating subjects of complaint on all these occasions was the persecution of English Protestants in Spain by the inquisition. The proposal of Alva to Lord Cobham does not appear unreasonable,—that Protestants should abstain from entering the churches during the time of mass, or if they did, should conform to the usual manner of worship; and that, if they met a procession of the sacrament, they should turn out of the way, or enter a house, unless they would act as others did.—Memorias, 359, 398.

been for a time impaired, had never been broken, and agreed that the commerce between England and the Netherlands should be restored; that Elizabeth should satisfy the Italian bankers, the original owners of the money which had been intercepted; and that commissioners should be appointed on both sides to determine, within two years, the demands of those who had suffered by the sequestration of merchandise in each country.[1] CHAP. IV. A.D. 1573.

Soon afterwards Alva was recalled, and succeeded by Requesens, commendator of Castile, who, though he possessed not the martial abilities of his predecessor, inflicted severe injuries on the insurgents, and sought by condescension to soothe the discontent of the people. He cultivated with assiduity the friendship of Elizabeth; ratified the accord of the commissioners appointed in pursuance of the treaty with his predecessor; expelled at her request the English exiles from the provinces; and obtained from her an order for the arrest of all armed vessels belonging to the insurgents in her dominions, and for their future exclusion from the English ports.[2] Dec. 2. 1574. August 1.

The queen had now adopted a new line of policy. She had hitherto consented to foment, at present she laboured to compose, the differences between Philip and his revolted subjects; and the king, at her solicitation, agreed to an armistice, preparatory to an intended negotiation.[3] But the prince of Orange Oct. 18.

[1] Murdin, 773, 774. Camden, 272. The number of Spanish merchantmen detained in the English ports was eighty-two, valued at one million one hundred and ninety thousand ducats.—Gonzales, Mem. 379.

[2] Camden, 295. 296. Camden attributes to him the dissolution of the English college at Douai; but Requesens died in 1576, and the college was transferred to Rheims in 1578.—Dodd, ii. 15, 219.

[3] Murdin, 289, 777.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1574. persisted in rejecting both her advice and her remonstrances, till the revival of the civil wars in France extinguished the hope of aid from that country, and convinced him that the friendship of Elizabeth was his last and best resource. Three deputies were accordingly sent to England, not to announce his willingness to an accommodation with Philip, but to offer the sovereignty, and, if that were refused, the protectorship, of Holland and Zeeland to the queen, as the representative of the ancient princes of those countries by her descent from Philippa of Hainault, the consort of Edward III. At first the offer flattered her pride and ambition; soon, however, her resolution began to waver. Could she sanction this transfer of allegiance from one prince to another without injury to her reputation, or danger to herself? She asked the advice of her counsellors, and the diversity of their opinions added to her perplexity. It was observed that she grew taciturn and peevish; the amusements of the court were suspended; and day after day was employed in secret consultation. The result was a communication to the deputies, that the queen could not in honour or conscience accept their offer, but that she would employ her best services to reconcile them with their sovereign.[1]

1576. January.

March 5. Requesens soon afterwards died, and the government devolved on a council of state. No provision had been made for the payment of the troops; they mutinied, lived at free quarters on the natives, and by

Nov. 4. the sack of Antwerp provoked the states to provide for their own safety. Representatives from the clergy, nobility, cities, and districts of all the Catholic pro-

[1] Camden, 297—299. Murdin, 778. Lodge, ii. 136.

vinces but Luxemburgh, met the deputies of the two Protestant states of Holland and Zeeland; and a confederacy, called the Pacification of Ghent, was formed, by which, without renouncing their allegiance to Philip, they bound themselves to expel all foreign soldiers, to preserve the public peace, to aid each other against every opponent, and to restore to its pristine vigour the constitution enjoyed by their fathers.[1] On the very day of the sack of Antwerp a new governor had arrived in Luxemburgh, Don Juan of Austria, the illegitimate son of the late emperor, Charles V.[2] He came encircled with the laurels which he had won from the Turks in the great battle of Lepanto, but the jealousy and obstinacy of the states compelled him to submit to the terms which they dictated, and by the persuasion of the secretary Escovedo, and with the approbation of Philip, he dismissed the Spanish army, and ratified the Pacification of Ghent. This concession, which was known by the name of "the perpetual "edict," surprised and disconcerted the prince of Orange, who, with the states of Holland and Zeeland, protested against it as not sufficiently explicit, and received in return a satisfactory explanation from the states general.[3] But Don Juan soon perceived that without an army he possessed only the name of governor; at Brussels his authority was no match for the influence of the prince of Orange; and the discovery of a real or pretended conspiracy against his life induced him to quit that city, and to retire to the

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1576. Nov. 8. December. 1577. Feb. 17. Feb. 19. March 1

[1] Du Mont, v. 279.

[2] He had travelled for greater security under the disguise of a black slave, with Octavio Gonzaga as his owner.—Cabrera, 872. Strada, l. ix.

[3] Du Mont, v. 288, 290.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1577.

strong fortress of Namur. There he assumed a bolder tone, called on every faithful Belgian to support the representative of his sovereign, and to rally round the standard of Philip. A renewal of hostilities was now inevitable. The governor recalled from Italy the Spanish troops whom he had so recently dismissed the prince solicited aid of men and money from England. Elizabeth betrayed her usual irresolution. On the one hand, was it for her, a sovereign herself, to encourage resistance to the authority of a sovereign? On the other, was it safe for her to suffer the subjugation of those states whom she had aided in their first struggles for their liberties? To escape from the dilemma, she earnestly exhorted both parties to observe with fidelity the "perpetual edict," as a compromise which effectually provided for the rights of the sovereign and of the people.

Juan of Austria was a prince of restless and aspiring mind. When he was torn from his imaginary kingdom of Tunis by the command of Philip, he amused or consoled his disappointment with another visionary project, that of winning for himself the crown of England. For this purpose the pope should supply him with a force of six thousand mercenaries under pretence of aiding the Knights of Malta; he would join them at sea with several Spanish regiments and land in England; the friends of the Scottish queen would hasten to his standard; that princess would be liberated from prison; a marriage would follow, and Juan and Mary would become king and queen of Scotland, and eventually of England. When he laid this plan before the pontiff, Gregory gave to it his assent; but the moment it was submitted to Philip, that monarch rejected it without hesitation.

Don Juan, he said, was now governor of the Netherlands, with matters of higher moment to claim his immediate attention; but his former project had been betrayed to the prince of Orange, who hastened to communicate the intelligence to Elizabeth, assured her that the recall of the Spanish force from Italy was part of the plan which had never been abandoned; and after several messages extorted her reluctant consent to a treaty, by which she became security for a loan of one hundred thousand pounds to the states, and engaged to supply them with an army of one thousand horse and five thousand foot, on condition that they should not make peace without her consent, nor afford an asylum to her rebels within their territories. To excuse this hostile proceeding to others, Dec. 22. perhaps to herself, the queen assured the Spanish monarch that she had no other object in view but his interest and her own security,—that is, to preserve the Netherlands from French invasion, and herself from the hostility of his brother; that she had exacted from the Belgians a promise not to throw off their allegiance to the crown of Spain; and that she would herself turn her arms against them, if they should ever violate that promise. Philip subdued his feelings, affected to believe her protestations, and expressed a hope that through her mediation tranquillity might be restored.[1]

[1] Murdin, 290, 779. Camd. 311—315, 320. Thuan. iii. 557. Strada, l. iii. an. 1576. Becchetti, xii. 220. Maffei has a singular addition. "E quando cio non si potesse ottenere, si facesse opera "di creare e gridare re publicamente il fratello del conté di Vincton, "uomo di fede sincera, ed accetto a quei popoli."—Maffei, Annali di Gregorio XIII. l. v. No. 26. See also Bomplani, Hist. Pontificatûs Gregorii XIII. p. 236. Of this design to marry the brother of the marquess of Winchester to Mary, and to proclaim them king and queen, I have found no notice in our historians.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1577. Nov. 11.

The states had chosen for governor the archduke Matthias, a young prince, brother to the emperor Rodolph; but he possessed little more than the title; the real authority was vested in the prince of Orange, with the subordinate rank of lieutenant-general.[1] On the other hand, Don Juan had been rejoined by the Spanish troops, under the command of the celebrated Farnese, prince of Parma. Offensive operations were resumed; and the decisive victory of Gemblours spread consternation through every province of the union. The states applied for additional aid to the German princes and the queen of England, and afterwards to the French duke of Anjou. 1. Casimir, brother of the elector Palatine, crossed the Rhine to their succour, with twelve thousand Germans, levied and paid with English gold. His followers were chiefly Protestants; with them, as with the native Protestants, it was a sacred duty to put down what they deemed idolatry; and therefore, wherever they found themselves the more powerful, they united in abolishing the Catholic worship, and inflicting severe injuries on the Catholic inhabitants. The Walloons were the first to complain. They discovered that they had only exchanged the despotism of Philip for the still more intolerable despotism of native and foreign fanatics. Why should they not return to the obedience of their lawful sovereign, provided he would secure to them the enjoyment of their national liberties? Don Juan profited by these sentiments; he received them as liege subjects of Philip; and, when Casimir approached his lines, opposed to him so determined a front, that the German deemed it prudent to withdraw. 2. With

1578. Jan. 21.

[1] Du Mont, v. 314.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1578.

respect to Anjou, he received the deputies with pleasure, and concluded with them a treaty, by which it was agreed that he should lead a French army into the Netherlands to the aid of the states, should receive three towns in Hainault and Artois for his own security, and should be at liberty to form an independent state for himself out of such conquests as he might make on the south of the Meuse. He kept his word at the head of ten thousand men; took Binche by assault, and prevailed on Maubeuge to open its gates. But here his progress terminated; and he attributed his forbearance to his deference to the queen of England, to whose hand he still aspired, and whose jealousy of the designs of the French court induced her to object to the presence of a powerful army under a French prince in the Netherlands.[1]

August 20.

September

The death of Don Juan at this period proved of no detriment to the Spanish interests. He was succeeded by Farnese, duke of Parma, his equal in the field and his superior in the cabinet. The prince of Orange, in despair of holding together the entire confederacy, summoned a meeting of the northern states at Utrecht, in which was formed a new association, afterwards known as the republic of the United Pro-

Oct. 1.

1579. Jan. 23.

[1] Strada, l. ix. x. xi. Bentivoglio, 246—253. See also, in Mr. Gage's elaborate history of the hundred of Thingoe in Suffolk, seven letters dated from Hengrave on the 29th of August to the ambassadors in the Low Countries, and their answer to the queen in Murdin, ii. 317. It was her earnest wish to restore the revolted provinces to Philip with security for their liberties, and above all to guard against the possible transfer of their allegiance to the crown of France: her ministers dared not oppose her openly, but employed every artifice to effect the entire separation of the Netherlands from Spain, even at the risk of their falling immediately under the dominion of the duke of Anjou, and ultimately of the king of France.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1579. vinces. Farnese, on the other hand, attached the Walloon provinces to Spain, by a solemn promise that the perpetual edict should be faithfully observed, and the foreign force replaced by a native army.[1] He met with no opposition from Anjou, whose followers, having been engaged to serve only for three months, were disbanded; whilst the prince himself turned his thoughts from conquests in the Netherlands to a marriage with the queen of England. During the last summer he had sounded her inclination by several messengers; now he requested permission to send to her his favourite Simier. Elizabeth would rather have seen the principal than the agent. She made difficulties; but at last consented to receive him, provided he came without parade, and kept secret the object of his mission.[2] But Simier soon overcame her displeasure, if she really felt as she pretended. He excelled in the accomplishments of a courtier; his manners, his wit, and his gallantry made an irresistible impression. Thrice in the week he was admitted to the queen's private parties; and it was observed that she never appeared so cheerful and so happy as in his company.[3] By her counsellors it was believed that she revealed to him secrets of state; and the tongue of slander whispered suspicions of the innocence of their meetings.[4] The result, however, showed that

May 17.

June 25.

1579. Oct. 27.

[1] Du Mont, v. 322, 350.

[2] Murdin, ii. 318.

[3] Murdin, 320. He was amatoriis levitatibus, facetiis et aulicis illecebris exquisite eruditus.—Camd. 322.

[4] Mary says to Elizabeth, as she had learned from Lady Shrewsbury, "Vous aviez non seullement engasgé votre honneur auveques "un estrangier nommé Simier, l'alant trouver de nuit en la chambre "d'une dame, ou vous le baisiez et usiez auvec luy de diverses pri-"vaultés deshonestes; mais aussi luy reveilliez les segretz du "royaulme, trahisant vos propres conseillers."—Murdin. 559. At last Anjou himself grew jealous, and recalled Simier, "de crainte

Simier wooed successfully for his master. Aware that his chief obstacle was the influence which Leicester possessed over her heart, he made it his first object to wean Elizabeth from her affection for that nobleman, by disclosing to her the secrets of his amours, and informing her of his recent marriage with the relict of the late earl of Essex, a marriage hitherto concealed from her knowledge. The queen was mortified and irritated; it was in vain that her confidant, Mrs. Ashley, spoke in favour of Leicester. "What," replied Elizabeth, "shall I so far forget myself as to "prefer a poor servant of my own making to the first "princes in Christendom?" The earl added to her displeasure by his indiscretion and impatience. He attributed the influence of the envoy to philtres and witchcraft; and occasionally let fall threats of personal vengeance. But the queen ordered him to be confined at Greenwich; and by proclamation took under her special protection all the members of the French embassy.[1] Attempts to prevent the marriage had been made by harangues from the pulpit; but the pulpit, the usual engine of political agitation in that age, was silenced by authority,[2] and the articles of a preparatory treaty were discussed between the agent and the queen's ministers. At length, wearied with their objections and delays, Simier applied for a final answer to Elizabeth herself, who eluded the question by replying that she could not make up her mind to marry one whom she had never seen. The hint, however, was taken; and the duke himself, travelling in disguise, arrived without previous notice at Greenwich.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1578.

1579. April 4.

June 16.

September

"qu'il ne gouvernast la reine avec trop de privaulté, comme il "faisoit."—Egerton, 271.

[1] Camd. 322, 329.

[2] Lodge, ii. 212.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1579. Elizabeth was surprised and gratified; his youth, gaiety, and attention atoned for the scars with which the small-pox had furrowed his countenance; and, after a private courtship of a few days, he departed with the most flattering expectations of success, both with regard to his intended marriage, and to his pre-

Oct. 2. tensions in the Netherlands. At the royal command the lords of the council assembled; they deliberated the greater part of the week; but, unable to agree,

Oct. 7. they waited on their sovereign, requesting to be made acquainted with her inclination, and promising, whatever it might be, to further it to the best of their power.[1] The love-sick queen burst into tears. She had expected, she said, that they would have unanimously petitioned her to marry; but she was simple, indeed, to confide so delicate a matter to such counsellors; they might depart, and come again when her mind should be more composed. That afternoon and the next day she vented, in bitter and vituperative language, her displeasure against the supposed adversaries of the marriage; the council hastened to commence a negotiation with Simier, whom the duke had left for that purpose; and a preliminary treaty was, after

Nov. 22. some hesitation, concluded.[2]

During this year, though neither of the contending parties in the Netherlands could boast of decisive success, the balance was on the whole in favour of Philip,

[1] Sussex, Burghley, and Hunsdon urged the marriage. Leicester and Hatton joined them at first, but went over to their opponents, Bromley, Mildmay, and Sadler. The chief arguments of the latter were the danger to religion from a Catholic husband, the offence of God, if he were allowed to have mass, even in private; the danger to the queen's life if, at that age, she should have issue; and the inutility of the marriage, if she had not.—Murdin, 321—336. Sadler, ii. 570.

[2] Murd. 337. Digges 250.

who, in the following spring, published the celebrated ban, by which he declared the prince of Orange a traitor, and promised a reward of twenty-five thousand crowns to the man who should take him prisoner, or deprive him of life.[1] The prince, on the other hand, publicly renounced his allegiance, and prevailed on the northern states to issue a declaration that Philip, by his invasion of their liberties, had forfeited his right to the sovereignty. This they followed by an appeal for protection to England and France; and, that they might secure the protection of both crowns, they made an offer of the government of their country to the duke of Anjou. St. Aldegonde was despatched to make the tender to that prince, and returned with two instruments, the one public, by which he notified his acceptance of that high office; the other secret, by which he engaged to sign a deed transferring to the prince the two provinces of Holland and Zeeland. In Belgium, this event was celebrated with public rejoicings, though the fanaticism of the Protestant soldiers, who plundered the churches of their Catholic allies, already sowed the seeds of disunion. In France, the duke hastened, in quality of mediator, to bring about an accommodation between the king, his brother, and the French Calvinists; and adventurers from both creeds, anxious to obtain the favour of the presumptive heir to the crown, offered to him their services in his projected expedition into the Low Countries. They were ordered to station themselves in readiness near the northern frontier.[2]

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1580.

March 15.

July 5.

Sept. 29.

Nov. 26.

[1] It is in Du Mont, v. 368. The defence of the prince by Villiers, formerly an advocate, now a minister of the Gospel, occurs ibid. 384.

[2] Bentivoglio, ii. 28, 33, 34. Cabrera, 112. Du Mont, v. 368, 380, 381.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1580.

On the first intelligence of the mission of St. Aldegonde, a new difficulty suggested itself, or was suggested, to the mind of Elizabeth. To give to Anjou the sovereignty of the Low Countries was, in all probability, to annex them to the crown of France, an addition of wealth and territory which might prove fatal to the trade and dangerous to the independence of England. If she were to permit it, would not her acquiescence be attributed to her passion for the duke? And if after that she were to marry him, would not her marriage be as hateful in the eyes of her subjects as had been that of her sister Mary with Philip of Spain? She wrote immediately to the ambassador Stafford, that "the banes of her nuptial feast should "not be savoured with the sauce of her subjects' "wealth:" that Anjou "must not procure her harm, "whose love he sought to win;" and that he ought "to suspend his answer to the States, till he had sent "some of quality and trust to communicate and con- "cur with that she might think best for both their "honours."[1] How this objection was removed, does not appear.[2] But the queen was not only induced to consent; she moreover made him a present of one hundred thousand crowns, and added a hint of her willingness to resume the treaty of marriage. Not a moment was lost. A splendid embassy, with the prince dauphin of Auvergne at its head, hastened from the French court; as they ascended the Thames, they were welcomed by the lords and the civic authorities from their barges; the crowds on the banks

[1] See the letter in Wright, ii. 150.

[2] Perhaps she was satisfied with the clause which stipulated that in no circumstances these countries should be incorporated with the crown of France.

hailed them with shouts of congratulation; and they landed under a salvo of artillery from the Tower. They had come with the persuasion that the queen really condemned her former inconstancy;[1] to their astonishment, they learned that she had recently discovered a new objection; to marry Anjou, after his acceptance of the sovereignty, would necessarily entail on her a war with Philip, whom his late acquisition of Portugal had rendered the most formidable prince in Europe; she therefore proposed, by her ambassador in France, to conclude in lieu of the marriage a league defensive and offensive between the two crowns.[2] Henry endeavoured to suppress his vexation; but to the importunities of the English envoys he always returned the same answer, that he was ready to subscribe such a league, whenever Elizabeth should have fulfilled her promise to his brother. His obstinacy at length prevailed; a treaty, grounded on that which had been drawn by Gardiner for the marriage between Philip and Mary, was concluded, and the term of six weeks was assigned for the time of the celebration of the contract, but with this extraordinary provision, that either party should be at liberty to recede, if

April 12.

August and September

[1] "L'on tient pour certain, qu'elle est resolue au marriage."—Egerton, 245.

[2] Digges, 351, 354, 400. Egerton, 253—258. Camden, 374. At the death of Henry (January 31, 1580), cardinal archbishop and king of Portugal, the right of succession was in the princes of the house of Braganza, as representatives of Edward, the youngest brother of the deceased monarch; but the crown was given, in a popular meeting at Santarem, to Don Antonio, commendator of Prato, the natural son of Don Louis, one of the other brothers. There appeared, however, another and more powerful claimant, Philip of Spain, the male heir of his mother, an elder sister. In the space of fifty-eight days Philip conquered the whole kingdom, with the exception of the small island of Tercera, which still acknowledged Don Antonio. That prince had come to England, and solicited the aid of Elizabeth.—Cabrera, 1001—1016, 1025.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1581. certain matters, respecting a league of perpetual amity, should not be accorded within that period to their mutual satisfaction. The six weeks passed away; Elizabeth was still irresolute, and Anjou, having crossed the frontier at the head of sixteen thousand men, and driven the prince of Parma from the siege of Cambray, hastened, at her request, to England. She received him with every demonstration of the most ardent attachment, and gave him a promise, written with her own hand (exacting at the same time a similar promise from him), to look upon his enemies as her own; to assist him in all cases in which he should require it, and not to treat with the king of Spain without his consent.[1] Soon after she had celebrated the anniversary of her accession, in the presence of the foreign ambassadors and of the English nobility, she placed a ring on his finger, saying that by that ceremony she pledged herself to become his wife; and commanded the bishop of Lincoln, the earls of Sussex, Bedford, and Leicester, and Hatton and Walsingham, to subscribe a written paper, regulating the rites to be observed, and the form of contract to be pronounced by both parties at the celebration of the marriage.[2] Every doubt was expelled from the minds

June 11.

Aug. 11.

Nov. 17.

Nov. 22.

[1] There were two promises, one more general than the other. Elizabeth acknowledges in them, that for attachment and constancy the duke was the most deserving of all her suitors, "de tous ceux, "qui nous ont recherchée et poursuivie d'amour."—Mémoires du duc de Nevers, i. 545. This narrative was written at the time by one of his suite.

[2] Daniel says that, when he wrote, the original was preserved in the library of M. Foucault.—Daniel, xi. 151. In the Mémoires de Nevers, we are told, that the particulars were agreed on the 11th of June; and that, as soon as the ceremony of marriage should be performed, each was to retire, the queen to attend at the reformed, the duke at the Catholic service, and then to meet again at the door. —Nevers, i. 568.

of the spectators; Castelnau hastened to inform the king of France; St. Aldegonde sent an express with the intelligence to the States; and the union of the queen and the duke, as if it had already been solemnized, was celebrated at Brussels with fireworks, discharges of artillery, and the usual demonstrations of joy.

Though Leicester, Walsingham, and Hatton, at the royal command, had put their signatures to the paper, they had previously, but secretly, arranged a new plan of opposition. When Elizabeth retired to her apartment in the evening, she was assailed by the tears and sighs of her female attendants.[1] On their knees they conjured her to pause before she precipitated herself into the gulf of evils which was open before her. They exaggerated the dangers to which women at her years were exposed in childbed; hinted at the probability that a young husband would forsake an aged wife for a more youthful mistress; represented to her the objections of her subjects to the control of a foreigner; and prayed her not to sully her fair fame, as a Protestant princess, by marrying a popish husband.

The duke, in the morning, received a message from the queen, and hastened to pay his respects to his supposed bride. He found her pale and in tears. Two more such nights as the last, she told him, would consign her to the grave. She had passed it in the deepest anguish of mind, in a constant conflict between her inclination and her duty. He must not think that her affection for him was diminished. He still possessed her heart; but the prejudices of her

[1] According to Nevers, she addressed her demoiselles in these words: "C'est à ce coup que j'ai un mari. Quant à moi, je suis "bien. Vous autres pourvoyez vous, si vous voulez."—Nev. 552.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1581.

people opposed an insuperable bar to their union. She had, after a long struggle, determined to sacrifice her own happiness to the tranquillity and the welfare of her kingdom.

When Anjou would have replied, Hatton, who was present, came to the aid of his mistress. He enumerated the common objections to the marriage; but insisted chiefly on the disparity of age: the queen was in her forty-ninth year. What probability was there that she would have issue? and, without the prospect of issue, what reasonable object could she have in marriage? Besides, the contract was conditional; it remained to be seen whether the king of France would ratify the terms on which it had been concluded. With the answer of the duke we are not acquainted; but he returned to his apartment pensive and irritated, and, throwing from him the ring, exclaimed that the women of England were as changeable and capricious as the waves which encircled their island.[1]

The news of the espousals had equally alarmed the zealots of both religions. In France it was pronounced from the pulpit, that the marriage of the presumptive heir to the monarchy with an heretical princess portended nothing less than the speedy downfall of the church. In England, the preachers compared their countrymen with the Jews, who demanded a king, and soon had reason to condemn their own folly. But that which chiefly irritated the queen was the bold and inflammatory language of a libel written by Stubbs, of Lincoln's Inn. It accused the ministers of ingratitude to their country, the queen of degeneracy from her

[1] For these particulars see Camden, 375, 376; Nevers, i. 552, 554; Daniel, xi. 150, 151.

former virtue; charged the French nation in general, and the duke of Anjou in particular, with the most odious vices; and described the marriage as an impious and sacrilegious union between a daughter of God and a son of the devil. Elizabeth, by proclamation, cleared the character of Anjou and his minister Simier, and ordered the libellous pamphlet to be burnt by the public executioner. The author, publisher, and printer were, in virtue "of a good and necessarye "lawe," passed in the first year of the queen,[1] condemned in the court of the King's Bench to lose their right hands, and to be imprisoned during the royal pleasure. The printer was pardoned; the other two, having petitioned in vain for mercy, suffered their punishment in the market-place of Westminster. Stubbs, the moment his right hand was lopped off, uncovered his head with the left, and waving his cap, exclaimed, "Long live the queen!"[2]

The duke of Anjou had demanded leave to depart. But the amorous queen could not bear the idea of separation. She requested him to remain, assured him of her intention to marry him hereafter,[3] sent messengers to renew the negotiation in Paris, loaded him with caresses in public as well as in private,[4] and

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 366.

[2] Camden, 378. Nugæ Antiquæ, i. 143, 149, 153, 158.

[3] "Il espère, voire s'assure, ainsy qu'il m'a escrit, qu'ils se "marieront ensemble, devant qu'il en parte."—Hen. III. to St. Goar, Nov. 27. Egerton, 266.

[4] Her conduct gave rise to the most scandalous tales. The French author of the memoir tells us that they spent their time together, and that she proved her affection to him by "baisers, "privautéz, caresses, et mignardises ordinaires entre amans."—Nevers, 555. The countess of Shrewsbury speaks still more plainly: "Qu'il vous avoit esté trouvée une nuit á la porte de vostre "chambre, ou vous l'aviez rencontré auvec vostre seulle chemise et "manteau de nuit; et que par après vous l'aviez laissé entrer, et

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1581. invented daily new plans of amusement to reconcile him to her capricious delays.[1] Thus three months rolled away. The godly were scandalized; the ministers dreaded the result; the states of Belgium impatiently demanded the presence of their new sovereign; and the duke himself began to feel the ridiculous part which he was compelled to act. At last his patience was exhausted, and he announced to the queen the day fixed for his departure, founding his resolution on the necessity of his presence in Belgium.[2] Elizabeth remonstrated, vented her displeasure on the States by calling their deputies "des coquins," and then yielded an unwilling assent, on condition that he should promise to return within a month. At Canterbury she parted from him in tears. As he pursued his journey to Sandwich, he received from her repeated messages of inquiry after his health; and the moment he embarked, the earl of Sussex followed him on board, with a most urgent request that he would return immediately to the queen. But it was then too late. He sailed for Flushing; she sought to bury her sorrows in privacy, studiously avoiding the very

1582. Feb. 1.

Feb. 8.

"qu'il demeura auvecques vous pres de troys heures."—Murdin, 558. From this passage the imagination of Whitaker has woven a strange and improbable tale (ii. 516).

[1] On new year's day the duke exerted himself much at a tournament. The moment it was over the queen ran to him, saluted him repeatedly in public, and led him by the hand to his bed-chamber, that he might repose himself. The next morning she visited him again before he rose. He had taken the following verse for his device:—

Serviet æternum, dulcis quem torquet Eliza.

Nevers, 555—557.

[2] Egerton, 260. The queen-mother, either to provoke a decision from Elizabeth, or for some other reason of state, had proposed a marriage between Anjou and an infanta of Spain. After his return to the Netherlands, she repeated the proposal. It appears to have been laughed at by Philip as a mere pretence.—Egert. 262—270.

sight of Whitehall, that the place might not obtrude upon her mind the recollection of the happy hours which she had spent in his company.[1]

For greater distinction, Elizabeth had ordered the earl of Leicester, with six lords, as many knights, and a numerous train of gentlemen, to accompany the duke, not only to the sea-side, but as far as the city of Antwerp. There he was solemnly invested with the ducal mantle as duke of Brabant, and afterwards at Feb. 19. Ghent was crowned as earl of Flanders. During the Aug. 20. summer, aided by England and France, he opposed, with chequered success, the attempts of the prince of Parma; but, observing that the States were jealous of his followers, and that the real authority was possessed not by himself, but by the prince of Orange, he conceived the idea of giving the law to his inferiors, by 1583. Jan. 6. seizing on the same day most of the principal towns in the country. The attempt failed in almost every instance; many thousands of his followers were slain; June 28. and he escaped, disheartened and ashamed, into France. His death, after a long indisposition, at Château 1584. June 10. Thierry, whether it were caused by poison, or intemperance, or disappointment, freed the queen from a passion, which probably would have led her into a repetition of her amorous follies.[2]

[1] "The departure was mournfull betwixt her highness and "Monsure; she lothe to let him gowe, and he as lothe to departe. "Her majestie wyll not cum to White Haule, because the places "shall not give cause of remembrance to hir of him, with whom "she so unwillingli parted. Monsure promised his returne in "March."—Lord Talbot, February 12. Lodge, ii. 260. The same is asserted by the author of the French Memoir.—Nevers, 559, 565. Egerton, 261.

[2] Egerton, 277. So much was she still attached to him, that on May 7, Stafford, the ambassador, was obliged to excuse himself for having informed her of the danger of the duke. She would not believe it, but accused Stafford of wishing his death. So severe

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1584. July 10.

Exactly a month after the death of Anjou, and four years after the publication of the ban by Philip, the prince of Orange, the founder of Belgian independence, perished at Delft, by a pistol-shot from the hand of Balthazar Gerard, a Burgundian adventurer. The assassin had no personal grief to avenge; it was fanaticism, with the prospect of reward, that urged him to the bloody deed. The most dreadful tortures were invented to punish the criminal; but he bore them for four successive days with an air of defiance and triumph. He denied that he was a murderer. He had only done the duty of a loyal subject; he had executed on a rebel the doom pronounced against him by his sovereign. Philip felt no remorse for his own part in the assassination of the prince—that he persuaded himself was not a crime, but an act of justice; but he seems to have shed a few tears over the fate of the man who had so fearlessly sacrificed himself in his service.[1]

Before I conclude this chapter I must call the attention of the reader to the state of Ireland, where, at the accession of Elizabeth, the reins of government were held by the earl of Sussex. Under Mary he had called a parliament to establish, under Elizabeth he

1560. Jan. 11.

was the reprimand, that he did not dare to inform her of the event when it actually happened. "I had thought to have written to her "majestie, but I darst not presume for feare of ministring cawse "of greefe."—Murdin, 397, 406. Castelnau bears testimony to her extreme "deuil et ennuy" at it.—Egerton, 157. It cannot be, as some writers have imagined, that all the tokens of attachment which she lavished on the duke were dictated by policy only, and not by affection; though it is true that she favoured his attempt on the Netherlands through hostility to Spain, and earnestly but fruitlessly advised Henry III. to assume the sovereignty left vacant at the death of his brother.—Egert. 154—160.

[1] See the documents in Egerton, 161, et seq.; Strada, l. v. dec. ii.

called another to abolish, the Catholic worship. It was enacted that the Irish should be reformed after the model of the English church; but both the nobility and the people abhorred the change; and the new statutes were carried into execution in those places only where they could be enforced at the point of the bayonet.[1]

Among the aboriginal Irish, the man who chiefly excited the jealousy of the government was Shane O'Neil, the eldest among the legitimate children of the earl of Tyrone. Henry VIII. had granted the succession to Matthew, a bastard son; but Shane claimed the chieftainry of Ulster as his right, and the natives honoured and obeyed him as the O'Neil. Through the suggestion of Sussex, he consented to visit Elizabeth, and to lay his pretensions before her. At the English court he appeared in the dress of his country, attended by his guard, who were armed with their battle-axes, and arrayed in linen vests dyed with saffron.[2] The queen was pleased, and, though she did not confirm his claim, dismissed him with promises of favour. Sometimes he rendered the most useful services to the English government; at other times

1562. Jan. 6.

[1] Irish St. 2 Eliz. 1, 2, 3.

[2] The native Irish are divided into galloglasses and kernes by the deputy, Senleger, in a letter to Henry VIII. He describes them thus: "One sorte be harnessed in mayle and bassenettes, having "every of them his weapon, callyd a sparre, moche like the axe of "the Towre, and they be named galloglasse; and for the more "parte ther boyes beare for them thre dartes a piece, which dartes "they throwe or (before) they come to the hand strike; they doo "not lightly abandon the fielde, but byde the brunt to the deathe. "The other sorte callid kerne ar naked men, but only ther shertes "and small cotes; and many tymes whan they come to the bycker, "but bare nakyd saving ther shurtes, and those have dartes and "shorte bowes, which sorte of people be bothe hardy and delyver "to serche woddes or maresses, in the whiche they be harde to be "beaten."—St. Pap. iii. 444.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1562. he revenged severely the real or imaginary injuries which he received. He was of a turbulent but generous disposition, proud of his name and importance, and most feelingly alive to every species of
1565. insult. At last he broke—perhaps was driven—into acts of open rebellion; repeated losses compelled him to seek refuge among the Scots of Ulster, equally
1567. July. enemies to the natives and the English; and the Irish chieftain was basely assassinated by his new friends, at the instigation of Piers, an English officer. By act
1569. of parliament the name, with the dignity of O'Neil, was extinguished for ever; to assume it was made high treason; and the lands of Shane and of all his adherents, comprising one-half of Ulster, were vested in the crown, with some trifling exceptions in favour of a few loyalists.[1]

But the reduction of Ulster did not secure peace in Ireland. The turbulence of the native chieftains, whether of Irish or English origin, precipitated them continually into local wars; and their attachment to the Catholic faith alienated them from a government by which their religion was proscribed. In every province insurrections broke out, but were everywhere suppressed, sometimes with greater, sometimes with less difficulty. The general punishment was the forfeiture of the lands of the delinquents; but it was found to be more easy to pronounce than to enforce such punishment. On this account Sir Thomas Smith, the secretary, suggested to the queen a new plan,

[1] Camden, 153—156. Rym. xv. 676. Irish St. 11 Eliz. sess. 3, 1. I may here notice the irregular manner in which the Irish parliaments were summoned. In the last, only ten counties out of twenty were called upon to return representatives; in this, on complaint being made, the judges were consulted, and several representatives sent by boroughs not incorporated, and some officers, who had returned themselves, were ejected.—See Leland, ii. 225, 242.

to colonize the forfeited districts with English settlers, who, having an interest in the soil, would be willing to oppose the natives without expense to the crown. CHAP. IV. A.D. 1569.

The experiment was made; lands were granted to the bastard son of the projector and to other adventurers; and the consequence was, that the districts of which they took possession were reduced to the state of a wilderness by endless and destructive wars between the new settlers and the native inhabitants.[1] The failure, however, was attributed, not to any defect in the system, but to the limited scale on which it had been tried. Walter Devereux, earl of Essex, offered to subdue and colonize with one thousand two hundred men the district of Clanhuboy, in the province of Ulster. By a contract between him and Elizabeth, it was agreed that each should furnish an equal share of the expense; and that the colony should be equally divided between them, as soon as it had been planted with two thousand settlers. Essex was dazzled with the splendid prospect before him; and his enemies at court stimulated him with predictions of success, though they had no other view than to remove him from the presence of the queen. When he had mortgaged his estates, and proceeded in the enterprise till it would be ruinous to retrace his steps, they began to throw impediments in his way. The summer was almost past before he could reach Ireland. There, Fitzwilliams, the lord deputy, objected to his powers; the natives, under Phelim O'Neil, opposed a formidable resistance;[2] and it was discovered that the provisions furnished by the queen were unsound, and her troops 1572. 1573.

[1] Camden, 271.

[2] Ibid. 286—288. The Irish annals assert that the next year Essex assassinated Phelim O'Neil at a banquet to which the native chief had been invited.—Leland, ii. 257.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1573.

ill provided with arms. He maintained himself with difficulty during the winter; but the lords Dacre and Rich, most of the gentlemen, and many of the common soldiers, with or without permission, returned to England. In the spring the enterprise was abandoned; and the earl consented to aid the deputy in suppressing the insurgents in different parts of the island. It would be tedious to follow this adventurous nobleman through his remaining career. He proposed plans which were approved and then rejected; he obtained leave to return home, and was sent back to Ireland with the empty title of earl marshal; and at length, after a succession of disappointments, he died at Dublin, of a dysentery, probably caused by anxiety of mind, though by report his death was attributed to poison, supposed to have been administered to him by the procurement of Leicester.[1] This new plan of

1575. November.

1576. Sept. 22.

[1] See an interesting account of his death in Hearne's Camden, Præf. lxxxix. Great pains were taken to prove to the queen and council that he died a natural death.—See Camden, 308, 309; and the Sydney Papers, i. 88. I may here add that, if the earls of Essex and Leicester were enemies, the countess of Essex and Leicester were friends. The latter, after the death or murder of his first wife, had cohabited with Douglas, the widow of Lord Sheffield. If we may believe her, they had been privately married; certain it is that she bore him a son, whose fortunes will claim the attention of the reader in a succeeding volume. At what time Leicester abandoned her for Lettice, countess of Essex, we know not; but there is reason to believe that she bore him two children during the absence of her husband in Ireland; a connection which was at last betrayed to the queen, and excited her indignation.—Memorias, vii. 397. After the death of Essex, they were secretly married, and, to justify this union, Leicester maintained that his alleged marriage with Lady Sheffield was the fiction of a disappointed woman. Sir Francis Knollys, the father of Lettice, was pacified; but, fearful that his daughter might hereafter be treated in the same manner as Lady Sheffield, he insisted that the ceremony should be repeated in his presence. For some time it was kept secret; but the reader has seen that it was revealed by Simier to Elizabeth, who from that moment professed herself an enemy to the woman that dared to become a rival for the heart of her favourite. Even the young earl of Essex, in the height

colonization was viewed with horror by the natives both of Irish and of English extraction. In the expulsion of the adherents of O'Neil they saw, or thought they saw, the fate which was reserved for themselves; and many chieftains, either in person or by messengers, implored the aid of the Catholic powers for the preservation of their property and of their religion. The kings of France and Spain were occupied with concerns of more immediate interest; but Gregory XIII., who had succeeded to the chair of St. Peter, lent a willing ear to their complaints and solicitations. In the bull of his predecessor, Ireland had not been named: but the omission was now supplied; and Gregory signed, though he did not publish, a new bull, by which Elizabeth was declared to have forfeited the crown of Ireland no less than that of England.[1] Among those who offered to carry it into execution, were Thomas Stukely and James Fitzmaurice. Stukely was an English adventurer, without honour or conscience, who had sold his services at the same time to the queen and to the pope, and who alternately abused the confidence and betrayed

of his power, pleaded for his mother in vain. He obtained, indeed, more than once, permission to introduce her to Elizabeth in the privy gallery; but whenever notice was sent to the queen, she always excused herself from leaving her room. At length, on the 27th of February, 1598, two-and-twenty years after the marriage, Elizabeth promised to meet her at dinner at the house of her brother, Sir William Knollys. Great preparations were made; the countess took with her a jewel of the value of three hundred pounds to present to her majesty; the coach drove to the door of the palace for the queen; yet she did not appear. Essex went to entreat her privately. She positively refused. The next day, however, the favourite brought them together; the countess kissed the queen's hand and breast, and Elizabeth kissed her in return. But this was all; her solicitations for a second interview were ineffectual.—See the Sydney Papers, ii. 92, 93, 95; Camden, 308, 309.

[1] Becchetti, xii. 221.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1576.

the secrets of each. Having obtained from the pontiff a ship of war, six hundred disciplined soldiers, and three thousand stand of arms, he sailed from Civita Vecchia to join Fitzmaurice at Lisbon; but immediately offered his services to Sebastian, king of Portugal, and perished in the company of that prince at the battle of Alcazar, against Abdalmelech, king of Fez and Morocco.[1] Fitzmaurice was an Irishman, the brother of the earl of Desmond, and an inveterate enemy to the English government. He suffered shipwreck on the coast of Gallicia; but, with the aid of the papal ambassador, procured other vessels, and, sailing from Portugal, took possession of the port of Smerwick, near Kerry. He had brought with him no more than eighty Spanish soldiers, a few Irish and English exiles, and the celebrated Dr. Sanders, in the capacity of papal legate.[2] But he trusted to the popularity of his name, the resources of his family, and the influence of a bull, which granted to his followers all the privileges usually enjoyed by the crusaders. His hopes were, however, disappointed; the Irish, taught by preceding failures, listened with coldness to his solicitations; he fell in a private quarrel with one of his kinsmen; and the invaders, to save themselves from destruction, sought an asylum among the retainers of the earl of Desmond. Though that nobleman made loud professions of loyalty, his conduct provoked suspicion; he was proclaimed a traitor, and his dominions were plundered by the English. At the moment when his fortunes appeared desperate, a ray of hope appeared. Lord Grey de Wilton, the new deputy, was defeated in the vale of

August 4.

1579. June.

[1] Becchetti, xii. 222. Camden, 323, 327. Cabrera, 997.
[2] Sanders died in Ireland the next year.—Dodd, ii. 76.

Glendalough; and San Giuseppe, an Italian officer in the pay of the pontiff, arrived at Smerwick from Portugal. with several hundred men, a large sum of money, and five thousand stand of arms. But the new comers had scarcely erected a fort, when they were besieged by the lord deputy on land, and blockaded on the sea side by Admiral Winter. San Giuseppe, in opposition to the advice of the officers, proposed to surrender; the soldiers joined in the opinion of their commander, and an offer was made to deliver the place to the besiegers. By the English it has been asserted, that no conditions were granted; by the foreigners, that they had capitulated for their lives. Sir Walter Raleigh entered the fort, received their arms, and then ordered or permitted them to be massacred in cold blood.[1] This disastrous event extinguished the last hope of Desmond; yet he contrived to elude the diligence of his pursuers, and for three years dragged on a miserable existence among the glens and forests. At last a small party of his

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1579. — 1580. Nov. 5. Nov. 11.

[1] The poet Spenser, secretary to Lord Grey, attempts to vindicate the conduct of the deputy, and says "that the enemy begged they "might be allowed to depart with their lives and arms, according to "the law of nations. He asked to see their commission from the "pope or the king of Spain. They had none, they were the allies "of the Irish. But the Irish, replied Grey, are traitors, and you "must suffer as traitors. I will make no terms with you; you may "submit or not. They yielded, craving 'only mercy;' which it "being not thought good to show them, for danger of them, if, being "saved, they should afterwards join with the Irish; and also for "terror to the Irish, who are much emboldened by those foreign "succours, and also put in hope of more ere long; there was no "other way but to make that short end of them as was made."—Cayley's Raleigh, vol. i. p. 21. Sir Richard Bingham, an eye-witness, says, "that they surrendered over-night to the lord deputy's will, "to have mercy or not," and the next morning the mariners and soldiers entered the place, and fell to "ryfling, and spoyling, and "withall kylling, which they never ceased whilest there lyved one." He estimates the slain at betwixt four and five hundred, or five and six hundred.—Wright, ii. 122.

CHAP. IV. A.D. 1580.

enemies, attracted by a glimmering light, entered a hut, in which they found a venerable old man without attendants, lying on the hearth before the fire. He had only time to exclaim, "I am the earl of Desmond," when Kelly of Moriarty struck off his head, which was conveyed, a grateful present, to Elizabeth, and by her order fixed on London bridge.[1]

[1] Becchetti, 222, 223. Wilk. Con. iv. 260. Camden 334—344, 406. Ellis, and Ser. iii. 93.

CHAPTER V.

PERSECUTION OF THE PURITANS—THE CATHOLICS—AND THE ANABAPTISTS—REVOLUTIONS IN SCOTLAND—MORTON IS EXECUTED FOR THE MURDER OF DARNLEY—PLOTS FOR THE LIBERATION OF MARY STUART—EXECUTION OF ARDEN AND THROCKMORTON—PENAL ENACTMENTS — HISTORY OF PARRY — HIS EXECUTION — FLIGHT AND CONDEMNATION OF THE EARL OF ARUNDEL—TRAGICAL DEATH OF THE EARL OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

In the preceding chapters the reader has witnessed the conduct of the English queen, as the ally of the insurgent religionists in France and the Netherlands. But, if for political objects she deemed it advisable to countenance their attempts against the authority of their sovereigns, she still retained the most rooted antipathy to their discipline and doctrine; and, in proportion as their brethren, the English Puritans, laboured to establish the reform of Geneva at home, she employed all the power of the crown to check their zeal, and to punish their disobedience. Year after year the most menacing proclamations were issued; first one, then another diocese was "purged;" and the deprived ministers clamorously complained of the hardness of their fate, of the severity of the commissioners, and of the extortions practised in the ecclesiastical courts.

I. Had the queen, however, confined herself to the deprivation of the nonconformists, she might perhaps

CHAP. V. A.D. 1580.

have justified her conduct by the principle that those who refuse to adopt the discipline cannot expect to be employed as the ministers of the established church. But her orthodoxy, or that of her advisers, proceeded further. All her subjects were required to submit to the superior judgment of their sovereign, and to practise that religious worship which she practised. Every other form of service, whether it were that of Geneva in its evangelical purity, or the mass with its supposed idolatry, was strictly forbidden; and both the Catholic and the Puritan were made liable to the severest penalties if they presumed to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences. It must appear singular, that so intolerant a system should be enforced by men who loudly condemned the proceedings of the last reign; but in its defence they alleged an argument founded on the distinction between internal and external worship. The queen, they said, "would not dive into consciences." Internally, her subjects might believe, might worship, as they pleased. All that she required was external conformity to the law. *That* she had a right to exact. If any man refused, the fault was his own; he suffered, not for conscience' sake, but for his obstinacy and his disobedience. That this miserable sophism should have satisfied the judgment of those who employed it, can hardly be credited; yet it was ostentatiously brought forward in proclamations; and was confidently urged by the English agents in their communications to foreign courts.[1]

[1] Strype, i. 582. Even Walsingham, though he says that the queen thinks consciences are not to be forced but won, adds, that "as a prince of great wisdom and magnanimity, she would suffer 'but the exercise of one religion."—Cabala, 407.

The Puritans had many friends in the house of Commons, who powerfully advocated their cause, and in every session covered the table with bills for a further reformation; but the queen as often checked their zeal, sometimes reprimanding them personally, sometimes forbidding the house to proceed, and sometimes ordering the bills themselves to be brought and delivered into her hands. She found a willing and able coadjutor in the archbishop, who defended with vigour the interests of the church over which he presided, and who, though he had occasionally to lament the caprice of his sovereign, kept her, by his counsels and perseverance, true to the cause of the hierarchy. For a while the dissidents cherished the hope of ultimate success; but their patience was gradually exhausted, and disappointment urged the zealots among them to expressions of rancour and acts of violence which their brethren of more sober judgment condemned. Pamphlets, abounding in the most scurrilous language, were published; and Burchet, a student of the Middle Temple, in a fit of religious frenzy, murdered Hawkins, an officer, in the open street. He had mistaken his victim for Hatton, the new favourite, and boasted aloud that he had slain the champion of papistry and the enemy of the Gospel.[1] The death of Hawkins alarmed the archbishop; an attempt was made to prove the existence

1573. October.

[1] Burchet was at first tried for heresy, and escaped the stake by abjuring the opinions attributed to him. The queen then determined to execute him by martial law; the warrant was even made out, but was recalled at the remonstrance of some of the council. However, Burchet relieved her from her trouble; for, taking his keeper Longworth to be Hatton, he knocked out the man's brains with a firebrand, and was, in consequence, condemned and executed for murder. It is evident that he was insane.—Camden, 284. Stowe, 677.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1574. — June.

of a conspiracy against the life of that prelate; and three divines of ultra-reforming principles were apprehended. But the council, after mature deliberation, pronounced the documents forgeries, and discharged the prisoners.[1]

1575. May 17.

The demise of Archbishop Parker was followed by the promotion of Grindall, a prelate from whose previous indulgence, and secret leaning to the Genevan theology, the Puritans promised themselves forbearance, if not protection. But the queen in a short time suspected the orthodoxy of the new metropolitan. He had always approved of certain meetings, called prophesyings, in which the neighbouring clergymen assembled to discuss religious subjects. The queen condemned them as nurseries of disobedience and sectarianism.

1577. May 7.

When she ordered their suppression, Grindall remonstrated. Her pride, or her jealousy, was offended; she suspended him from the exercise of his authority; a threat of deprivation was added; and more than two years elapsed before he was restored, at his humble petition, and after a sincere acknowledgment of his offence. He could not, however, recover her favour; in a short time he received a royal order to resign his see; and, if he was spared the mortification, it was only by his death, which had been hastened through anxiety of mind and the enmity of his sovereign.[2]

1583. July 6.

He was succeeded by a prelate of a more stern and orthodox character, Archbishop Whitgift, whose pen had already proved

[1] Collier, 547.

[2] Strype's Grindall, 231, 272, 277, 286. Lansdowne MSS. xxxvii. 18; xxxviii. 69. Camden assures us, that the real cause of his disgrace was his condemnation of the unlawful marriage of Giulio, the celebrated physician of Leicester, who from that moment laboured to effect his ruin. Grindall was the founder of the school at St. Bees, in Cumberland.—Camden, 403.

him an able champion of the establishment, and whose vigilance and intrepidity in his new office detected the secret attempts, and defeated the open attacks, of its adversaries. As a test of orthodoxy, he proposed a subscription to three articles, which asserted that the queen was the supreme head of the church, that the ordinal and book of common prayer contained nothing contrary to the word of God, and that the thirty-nine articles were to be admitted as agreeable to the Holy Scriptures. To these the Puritans opposed others; but the archbishop suspended the clergymen who refused to subscribe; and, in defiance of the clamour of his enemies and of the intrigues of their friends in the council, prevented every projected change in the constitution or the discipline of the church.[1]

CHAP. V. A.D. 1583.

To restrain the violence of the dissident writers, an act had been recently passed, making it felony "to "write, print, or set forth any manner of book, "rhyme, ballad, letter, or writing containing any "false or seditious matter to the defamation of the "queen's majesty, or the encouraging of insurrection "or rebellion within the realm."[2] That a polemical treatise against parts of the book of common prayer should come within the operation of this statute, will excite surprise; but it was held that such a tract, by endeavouring to subvert the constitution of the church and the supremacy of the queen, tended to the encouragement of rebellion and the defamation of the sovereign. Thacker and Copping, two nonconforming ministers, and Wilsford, their lay disciple, were indicted and convicted under the statute. Wilsford

June 4.

[1] Camden, 404. Strype's Parker, 115. Whitgift, 137.
[2] Stat. of Realm, iv. 659.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1583. June 6.

saved his life by taking the oath of supremacy; the others refused, and died martyrs to their religious principles.[1]

II. But the sufferings of the Puritans bore no comparison with those of the Catholics. The Puritans were considered as brethren whose transgressions sprung from an exuberance of zeal; the Catholics as idolaters, whose worship could not be tolerated by the true servants of the Almighty: the poverty of the former offered no reward; the wealth of the latter presented an alluring bait to the orthodoxy of their persecutors. As early as the year 1563 the attention of the emperor Ferdinand had been called to the sufferings of the English Catholics. In different letters he recommended to the queen the practice of toleration, solicited her indulgence in favour of the deprived bishops, and exhorted her to grant one church, at least, in each populous town for the exercise of the Catholic worship. To the first of these requests she replied, that, by screening the prelates from the penalties to which they were liable by law, she had already fulfilled his wish; to the other, that such a concession was contrary to her conscience; "it "was a thing evil in itself, and unprofitable to those "for whom it was required."[2]

Sept. 24.

Many of the more zealous or more timid among the Catholics sought, with their families, an asylum beyond the sea. Their lands and property were imme-

[1] These men were Brownists, a class of ultra Puritans, who, looking upon the church of England as an unchristian church, refused to communicate with it.—Neal, c. vi. Strype, iii. 186.

[2] Strype, i. 370. Pollini, 353. The penalties to which the queen alluded were those incurred by the refusal of the oath of supremacy, which she had forbidden to be tendered to the deprived prelates.

diately seized by the crown, and given, or sold at low prices, to the followers of the court.[1] Those who remained might be divided into two classes. Some, to escape the penalties, attended occasionally at the established service, and endeavoured to elude the charge of hypocrisy by maintaining, from the words of the queen's proclamation, that such attendance was with them nothing more than the discharge of a civil duty, an expression of their obedience to the letter of the law. But this evasion did not satisfy more timorous consciences. The greater number abstained from a worship which they disapproved, and were, in consequence, compelled to pass their lives in alarm and solicitude. They lay at the mercy of their neighbours and enemies; they were daily watched by the pursuivants; they were liable at any hour to be hurried before the courts of High Commission, to be interrogated upon oath how often they had been at church, and when, or where, they had received the sacrament; to be condemned as recusants to fines and imprisonment, or as persons reconciled to forfeiture and confinement for life.[2] Their terrors were renewed every year by proclamations, or secret messages, calling upon the magistrates, the bishops, and

[1] In Strype (ii. App. 102) may be seen a list of fugitives, comprehending sixty-eight names, certified for this purpose into the Exchequer.

[2] Among those imprisoned and fined, were Hastings Lord Loughborough, Sir Edward Waldegrave, Sir Thomas Fitzherbert, Sir Edward Stanley, Sir John Southworth, the ladies Waldegrave, Wharton, Carew, Brookes, Morley, Jarmin, Browne, Guilford, &c. —Strype, i. 233, 327; ii. 110, 255, 263, 408, 416, 495. Strype's Grindall, 138, 151, 152. In Haynes is a singular letter to the council from the bishops of London and Ely; who, having examined the persons taken at mass at Lady Carew's, suggested that the priest should be tortured, to make him confess the names of those who had attended on other occasions.—Haynes, 365.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1583.

the ecclesiastical commissioners, to redouble their vigilance and enforce the laws respecting religion. Private houses were searched to discover priests or persons assisting at mass. The foreign ambassadors complained of the violation of their privileges, by the intrusion of the pursuivants into their chapels;[1] and even Elizabeth herself, to give the example, occasionally condescended to commit to prison the recusants who were denounced to her in the course of her progresses.[2]

Queen Mary's priests, as the ancient nonconforming clergy were called, had continued for years to exercise their functions in private houses, at considerable risk to themselves and their patrons. But death annually thinned their numbers; the deprived bishops were prevented from ordaining others to succeed in their places; and it was confidently expected that, in the course of a short time, the Catholic priesthood, and with it the exercise of the Catholic worship, would become extinct in the kingdom.[3] If both were per-

[1] Strype, i. 327; ii. 212, 410. Strype's Whitgift, 90, 1, 5, 7.

[2] "Her majestie hath served God with great zeale and comfortable examples; for by her counsaille two notorious papists, younge Rookewoode, and one Downes, a gentleman, were both comytted, th' one to the town preson at Norwyche, the other to the countrie preson there, for obstynate papistrie; and vii. more gents. of worship were comytted to several houses in Norwych as presoners; two of the Lovells, another Downes, one Beningfild, one Pary, and too others not worthe memory, for baddness of belyffe." The queen lodged at Rookewoode's house, at Euston; and, thanking him for the lodging, gave him her hand to kiss. "But my lord chamberlayn (the earl of Sussex), noblye and gravely, understanding that he was excommunicated for papistrie, cawled him before him; demanded of him how he durst presume to attempt her reall presence, he, unfytt to accompany any Crystyan person; forthwith sayd he was fytter for a payre of stocks; commanded him out of the coort, and at Norwych he was comytted." —Lodge, ii. 186. Aug. 30, 1578.

[3] Allen's reply to Burghley's "Execution of Justice," c. iii.

petuated, it was owing to the foresight of William Allen, a clergyman, of an ancient family in Lancashire, and formerly principal of St. Mary's Hall in Oxford. To him it occurred that colleges might be opened abroad, in lieu of those which had been closed to the Catholics at home. His plan was approved by his friends; several foreign noblemen and ecclesiastical bodies offered their contributions; and Allen established himself in the university of Douay. At first he had only six companions; the number was multiplied by the accession of many among the exiles, and of still more from the English universities; and in a short time the new college contained no fewer than one hundred and fifty members, many of them eminent scholars, all animated with zeal for the propagation of that religion on account of which they had abandoned their own country and sought an asylum in a foreign clime. Their object was to study theology, to receive orders, and to return to England. Thus a constant succession was maintained; and in the course of the first five years Dr. Allen sent almost one hundred missionaries into the kingdom.[1]

A.D. 1583.

1568.

The success of this establishment disconcerted the lords of the council, who resolved to try the influence of terror by subjecting the missionaries and their abettors to the utmost severity of the law. The first victim was Cuthbert Mayne,[2] a priest in Cornwall,

[1] Camden (347) has given an account of the seminarists which appears to be taken from the declamatory invectives of the crown lawyers during the trials of the missionaries. They universally denied these charges; which were victoriously answered by Dr. Allen, in a tract entitled "Apology and True Declaration of the "Institution and Endeavours of the Two English Colleges," &c.—See extracts from it in Mr. Butler's valuable "Memoirs of the English Catholics," i. 211.

[2] It should be observed that Mayne, though the first *seminary*

CHAP. V. A.D. 1577. Sept. 16. who was charged with having obtained a bull from Rome, that he denied the queen's supremacy, and said mass at Golden near Truro, the house of Mr. Tregean. Of these offences no satisfactory evidence was offered; but the court informed the jury that, where proof could not be procured, strong presumption might supply its place; and a verdict of guilty was accordingly returned. This was the first capital conviction under the statute, and as one of the two judges disputed the legality of the proceedings, the question was referred to the lords of the council, who, after a suspense Nov. 29. of two months, ordered the judgment to be carried into execution. Mayne suffered with constancy the cruel death of a traitor.[1] With him had been condemned in a premunire fifteen persons, partly neighbours and partly servants, as aiders and abettors of his treason; and at the next assizes Tregean himself received the same judgment. He was immediately cast into prison in the common jail at Launceston, and his estate was seized by the crown. He had once enjoyed the favour but afterwards incurred the enmity of the queen; now, no, solicitation could obtain from her any alleviation of his fate. For eight-and-twenty years he remained a prisoner either at Launceston or in the Fleet in London. After her death, he obtained his liberty from James at the solicitation of the king of Spain, but on condition that he should expatriate himself for ever. The old man hastened to the court

priest who suffered, had been preceded by Thomas Woodhouse, one of Queen Mary's priests, who on June 19, 1573, was drawn, hanged, and butchered alive at Tyburn, for the denial of the queen's supremacy.—Stowe, 677. Gonzales, 136. Memorias, 384.

[1] Bridgewater, 34. 35. Dodd, ii. 92—94; and the old edition of the State Trials. The bull was merely a copy of a jubilee which Mayne said he had bought through curiosity at a shop.

of his benefactor, from whom he received a gracious welcome and a munificent provision.[1]

The impulse was now given. The fate of Mayne and Tregean stimulated the zeal of those who professed to be the adversaries of popery. A more active search was made after recusants; every jail in the kingdom numbered among its inmates prisoners for religion; and on one occasion not fewer than twenty Catholics of family and fortune perished of an infectious disease in the castle of York.[2] Nelson, a priest, and Sherwood, a layman, who by force of torture, or through captious interrogations, had been led to a denial of the queen's supremacy, were drawn, hanged, and quartered. 1578. Feb. 3.

But the experience of ages has proved that such severities cannot damp the ardour of religious zeal. Missionaries poured into the kingdom. Gregory XIII. established an additional seminary in Rome;[3] and 1579. April 29.

[1] Dodd, ii. 169—172; and De vita Francisci Tregeon. Edidit F. Plunquetus, nepos ejus maternus. Olisipone, anno 1655. From Madrid Tregean went to Lisbon for the benefit of his health, and died there on the 25th of September, 1608. His children made several, but fruitless attempts to recover their father's property from Charles I.

[2] Bridgewater, 38, 298. From the accumulation of filth, and want of ventilation, such diseases were common in the prisons of this period. A similar fate befell the Catholics in Newgate, in July, 1580.—Strype, iii. App. 151. But the most singular instance occurred at Oxford, on July 6, 1577, at the trial of Jenks, a Catholic bookseller. Suddenly the two judges, the sheriff, the undersheriff, four magistrates, most of the jurors, and many of the spectators, were seized with a most violent pain in the head and stomach, which was succeeded by delirium, and in the course of thirty hours ended in death. This disease was not extirpated till the 12th of August; and, what is more remarkable, it was confined to the male sex, and in general to persons in respectable situations in life.—See Camden, 316; Lodge, ii. 160; Wood, i. 294; Bridgewater, 37.

[3] The hospital of Santo Spirito, erected in 1204, stands on the very site of the ancient Saxon school, or hospital for Saxon pilgrims,

CHAP. V. A.D. 1579.

Mercurianus, the general of the Jesuits, assented to the request of Allen, that the members of his order might share in the dangers and the glory of the mission. For this purpose he selected Robert Persons and Edward Campian, two Englishmen of distinguished merit and ability. Their arrival awakened the suspicion of the queen and of the council; it was believed, or at least pretended, that they had come with the same traitorous object as Sanders, who in the preceding year had animated the insurgents in Ireland to oppose the authority of the sovereign; and the pursuivants were stimulated with promises and threats to seek out and apprehend the two missionaries. At the same time the queen, by proclamation, commanded every man, whose children, relations, or wards had gone beyond the sea for education, to make a return of their names to the ordinary, and to recall them within four months, and warned all persons whomsoever, that if they knew or heard of any Jesuit or seminarist in the kingdom, and either presumed to harbour him or did not reveal where he was concealed, they should be prosecuted and punished as abettors of treason.[1]

1580. June 22.

July 15.

which was totally destroyed in the celebrated conflagration of the Borgo in 847. In its place was afterwards established an hospital for travellers and infirm persons of the English nation in the Via di Monserrato, called the hospital of the Holy Trinity and St. Thomas. This was in 1362. About thirty years later a second hospital was established in Trastevere, near the church of San Grisogono. In the year 1464 these two establishments were united under the same warden; and in 1579 Gregory XIII. opened them to the English exiles, who had resorted to Rome to study in the university. On the 23rd of April, 1579, he dissolved the hospitals, and in their place erected a college, giving to it the revenue of the former establishments, about fourteen hundred crowns per annum, and adding a yearly pension of three thousand crowns, till its income from other sources should reach to that amount.—See Mr. Tierney's edition of Dodd, iii. p. 168, note.

[1] Camden, 348. Sanders, 384. At this time a letter was sent

When the parliament assembled, the ministers called on the two houses for laws of greater severity, to defeat the devices of the pope, who had sent Jesuits into the realm to preach a corrupt doctrine, and to sow, under the cover of that doctrine, the seeds of sedition.[1] Every measure which they proposed was readily adopted. It was enacted, 1. That all persons, possessing, or pretending to possess, or to exercise, the power of absolving, or of withdrawing others from the established religion, and all suffering themselves to be so withdrawn, should, together with their procurers and counsellors, suffer the penalties of high treason: 2. That the punishment for saying mass should be increased to a fine of two hundred marks, and one year's imprisonment; of hearing mass to one hundred marks, and imprisonment for the same period: 3. That the fine for absence from church should be fixed at twenty pounds per month (which was adjudged to mean a lunar month), and that, if the absence were prolonged to an entire year, the recusant should be obliged to find two securities for his good behaviour in two hundred pounds each; and, 4. That to prevent the concealment of priests as tutors or schoolmasters in private families, every person acting in such capacity without the approbation of the ordinary should be liable to a year's imprisonment, and the person who employed him to a fine of ten pounds per month.[2] It is plain that, if these provisions had been fully executed, the profession of the Catholic creed must, in a few years, have been entirely extinguished.

to Sir Henry Sydney, president of Wales, reprehending him for his tardiness in executing the commission against the Catholics, and informing him that "his doings were narrowly observed."—Sydney Papers, i. 276.

[1] D'Ewes, 286.

[2] St. 23 Eliz. c. 1.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1581.

Persons and Campian, before they separated, had, in answer to the queen's proclamation, explained in writing the motives which induced them to visit their native country. Each confided his own paper to the care of a friend, with an injunction not to make it public, unless the writer were apprehended and thrown into prison. But the zeal of Pound, one of these friends, did not allow him to obey. He betrayed his trust, and published the paper of Campian under the title of a letter to the lords of the council. In it the missionary asserted that he was come solely to exercise the spiritual functions of the priesthood, and had been strictly forbidden to meddle with worldly concerns or affairs of state; requested permission to dispute on religion before the queen, the council, and the two universities; and declared that all the Jesuits in the world had been made a holy league to brave every danger, suffer every kind of torment, and shed their blood, if it were necessary, for the restoration and propagation of the Catholic faith. The bold tone of this letter gave considerable offence, which was greatly increased by the publication of another tract from the pen of the same writer, enumerating ten reasons on which he founded his hope of victory in the proposed dispute before the universities.[1]

For nearly a year Campian eluded the pursuit of his enemies; but during that time the Catholics had been exposed to severities of which they had previously no

[1] Both the letter to the council and the tract addressed to the universities may be seen in Bridgewater, i. 2, 5—19. An incorrect and mutilated copy was published by Strype, iii. App. 13. Bartoli has given an abstract of the letter of Persons, p. 13. Other letters of the two missionaries may be found in Bridgewater, p. 3, and in Strype, though with an erroneous date and address, vol. iii. App. 151.

conception. The names of all the recusants in each parish, amounting to about fifty thousand, had been returned to the council; the magistrates were repeatedly blamed for their want of activity and success; and the prisons in every county were filled with persons suspected as priests, or harbourers of priests, or delinquents against one or other of the penal laws. No man could enjoy security even in the privacy of his own house, where he was liable at all hours, but generally in the night, to be visited by a magistrate at the head of an armed mob. At a signal given, the doors were burst open; and the pursuivants, in separate divisions, hastened to the different apartments, examined the beds, tore the tapestry and wainscoting from the walls, forced open the closets, drawers, and coffers, and made every search which their ingenuity could suggest, to discover either a priest, or books, chalices, and vestments, appropriated to the Catholic worship. To resist or to remonstrate was only to provoke additional aggression. All the inmates were interrogated; their persons were searched, under the pretext that superstitious articles might be concealed among their clothes; and there are instances on record of females of rank, whose reason and lives were endangered from the brutality of the officers.[1] At length Campian was taken at Lyfford in Berkshire, and conveyed in procession to the Tower; Persons continued for some months to brave the danger which menaced him; but at length, at the urgent request of his friends, both for their security and his own, he retired beyond the sea.

A.D. 1581.

July 17.

[1] By such means Lady Nevil was frightened to death in Holborn, and Mrs. Vavasor lost her reason in York.—See Bridgewater, 34, 55, 289, 299, 319; Bartoli, 118—121. See note (N).

CHAP. V. A.D. 1581.

The use of the torture was common to most of the European nations; in England, during the reign of Elizabeth, it was employed with the most wanton barbarity.[1] The Catholic prisoner was hardly lodged in the Tower before he was placed on the rack; and, if he were supposed to be a priest, was interrogated why he had come to England, where he resided, whom he had reconciled, what he had learned from the confession of others, and in what places his colleagues were concealed.[2] The second time that Campian suffered the torture, he made disclosures which he deemed of no importance, but which report exaggerated and misrepresented. His brethren were scandalized; and, for their satisfaction, he protested in a letter to a friend, that, though he had mentioned the names of certain gentlemen in whose houses he had been received, yet "he had never discovered any "secrets there declared, and never would, come rack, "come rope."[3] This letter was intercepted; and the "secrets" were interpreted to allude to some mysterious conspiracy against the queen. Campian was

Oct. 31.

[1] See numerous instances in Bridgewater, 56, 176, 179, 191, 196, 222, &c., and note (O) at the end of the volume. In 1578 Whitgift, bishop of Worcester, and vice-president of Wales, was ordered to employ torture to force answers from Catholics suspected of having heard mass.—Strype's Whitgift, 83.

[2] Bridgewater, 27, 197, 296.

[3] "We have gotten from Campian knowledge of all his pere-"grination in England—Yorkshire, Lancashire, Denbigh, North-"ampton, Warwick, Bedford, Buckingham, &c. We have sent for "his hosts in all countreys."—Letter in Digges, August 10, p. 1581. The confession itself may be seen in Strype, iii. 578. He asserted on the scaffold that it had been drawn from him by the assurance of the commissioners given upon oath, that his harbourers should not be molested.—Bridgewater, 65. They were, however, summoned before the council, as we have seen; and some of them were imprisoned and severely fined.—Strype, iii. 126. Strype's Parker, 376. Digges, 390. In his letter to Pound, he expressed his sorrow for his weakness and credulity.—Howell's State Trials, 1060.

twice more stretched on the rack; he was kept on that engine of torture till it was thought he had expired; but he always persisted in the assertion that the secrets to which he had alluded regarded not matters of state, but the private sins of individuals, which they had confided to him in confession, and which he was forbidden to reveal by all laws, both human and divine.[1] CHAP. V. A.D. 1581.

Elizabeth herself had been desirous to see this celebrated man. By her order he was secretly brought one evening from the Tower, and introduced to her at the house of the earl of Leicester, in the presence of that nobleman, of the earl of Bedford, and of the two secretaries. She asked him if he acknowledged her for queen. He replied, not only for queen, but for his lawful queen. She then inquired if he believed that the pope could excommunicate her lawfully. He answered that he was not a sufficient umpire to decide in a controversy between her majesty and the pope. It was a question which divided the best divines in Christendom. In his own opinion, if the pope were to excommunicate her, it might be insufficient, as he might err. By his ordinary power he could not excommunicate princes. Whether he could by that power which he sometimes exercised in extraordinary emergencies, was a difficult and doubtful question,

[1] Howell, ibid. Between the torturings he had been several times called to dispute on religion, sometimes publicly in the chapel, and sometimes in private. Camden says that he hardly supported his reputation (expectationem excitatem ægre sustinuit, 349); the Catholic writers boast of his success, and appeal to the conversions by which the conferences were followed.—Bartoli, 167, 183. Two of the audience were committed to prison, because they said that Campian "was discreet and learned, and disputed very well."—Strype's Aylmer, App. ii.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1581.

to which some persons had answered in the affirmative.[1]

Nov. 12.

At length Campian, twelve other priests, and one layman, collected from different prisons, were arraigned in two separate bodies. They had come prepared to profess their religious belief; to their astonishment they were indicted for a conspiracy to murder the queen, to overthrow the church and state, and to withdraw the subjects from the allegiance due to the sovereign. Even the particulars were specified; the places, Rome and Rheims; the time, the months of March and April in the preceding year; and their very journey from Rheims to England, supposed to have been begun on the 8th of May last. It is not difficult to account for the surprise of the prisoners. Several among them had not been out of England for many years; several had never visited Rheims or Rome in their lives; some had not even seen each other before they met at the bar. They declared that, whatever might be pretended, their religion was their only offence; and, in proof of the assertion, remarked that liberty had been previously offered to each individual among them, provided he would conform to the established church.

Nov. 20.

The report of their trial must convince every reasonable man of their innocence. Campian, with his usual ability and eloquence, vindicated the missionaries from the charge of disloyalty, and showed that not an atom of evidence had been adduced to connect himself and his companions with any attempt against the life

[1] Bartoli, 160. Howell's State Trials, 1062. It appears, from numerous instances, that, in the language of the age, deposition was supposed to be included in the meaning of the word "excommunication," when applied to the queen.

or the safety of the queen. But the public mind had been prepared to believe in the existence of the conspiracy by a succession of arrests, sermons, and proclamations; the absence of proof was amply supplied by the invectives, the conjectures, and the declamations of the lawyers for the crown; and the jury, after an hour's deliberation, returned a verdict of guilty against all the prisoners. Before judgment was pronounced, Lancaster, a Protestant barrister, rose and made oath that Colleton, one of the number, had consulted him in his chambers in London on the very day on which he was charged with having conspired at Rheims. Colleton was remanded; the others were adjudged to suffer the death of traitors.[1] A.D. 1581.

An attempt was, however, made to save the lives of the prisoners. Some of the council objected that, to put to death so many Catholic priests at a time when the duke of Anjou was in London, would be to offer an insult to the prince whom the queen had chosen for her husband; but Burghley contended that it was necessary to allay the apprehensions of the Protestants. Let some at least pay the penalty of their treason. It would prove to the world that the queen was ready to sacrifice her dearest inclinations to the safety of her religion. His opinion prevailed.[2] Campian, Sherwin, and Briant were selected for execution, and suffered the punishment of traitors, asserting their innocence, and praying with their last breath for the queen as their legitimate sovereign. The other nine, who were permitted to remain several months under sentence of death, were repeatedly examined by commissioners, and required to declare their opinions respecting the

Dec. 1.

[1] State Trials, 1049, 1072. Bridgewater, 219, 304—307.
[2] Camden, 379. Bartoli, 209.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1581.

deposing power of the pontiff, and what part they would take in case of an attempt to put the papal bull in execution.[1] Bosgrave a Jesuit, Rishton a priest, and Orton a layman, gave satisfactory answers; they saved their lives, but did not recover their liberty. The other seven replied, that their opinions had nothing to do with the crime for which they had been unjustly condemned; that they were incompetent to determine the controversy between the pope and their sovereign; that they believed as the Catholic church believed, and would on all occasions behave as Catholic priests ought to behave. These answers were deemed evasive; and they all suffered at Tyburn, protesting, as their companions had already done, that they were innocent of treason, and dutiful subjects to their sovereign.

1582. May 30.

That the conspiracy with which these men were charged was a fiction cannot be doubted. They had come to England under a prohibition to take any part in secular concerns, and with the sole view of exercising the spiritual functions of the priesthood. This they deemed a sacred duty, and for this they generously risked their liberty and their lives. Even their principal accuser afterwards vindicated their innocence, and, in excuse for his own falsehood, alleged the terror that seized him when he was led to the foot of the rack, and saw himself surrounded with the in-

[1] On the 1st of April the queen, to silence the murmurs of the public, issued a proclamation, declaring that Campian and his fellow-prisoners had been justly put to death; and stating in proof of their treasonable intentions, the queries which had been put to him and his companions, and the answers which they had returned. Both may be seen in Howell's State Trials, i. 1078; and in Mr. Butler's Memoirs of the British Catholics, i. 200, App. 360. I may observe, that the answers attributed to Campian are very different from those which at his trial he asserted that he had given.

struments of torture.[1] At the same time it must be owned that the answers which six of them gave to the queries were far from satisfactory. Their hesitation to deny the deposing power (a power then indeed maintained by the greater number of divines in Catholic kingdoms) rendered their loyalty very problematical, in case of an attempt to enforce the bull by any foreign prince. It furnished sufficient reason to watch their conduct with an eye of jealousy, and to require security for their good behaviour on the appearance of danger, but could not justify their execution for an imaginary offence. Men are not to be put to death now, because it is barely possible that in one particular contingency they may prove traitors hereafter. The proper remedy would have been to offer liberty of conscience to all Catholics who would abjure the temporal pretensions of the pontiff. But this was an effort of liberality not to be expected in an intolerant age, and from the advocates of a principle which

[1] Nichols was a Protestant, who, going abroad, abjured his religion to gain admission into the seminaries, and, being ejected for misconduct, returned to England. He was immediately arrested, and conformed. His conversion was much talked of. He was described as a Jesuit, and preacher to the pope; and the bishops were compelled by the council to subscribe fifty pounds per annum for his maintenance, till he could be provided for in the church.—Strype's Grindall, 262. He made many discoveries, and published a book replete with calumnies against the pontiff and the seminarists. Yet he was not produced at the trial; soon afterwards he recalled his charges against the missionaries, and crossed the sea to France. At Rouen he was thrown into prison, whence he wrote several letters to Dr. Allen, and confessed that all he had said or done proceeded from the fear of the rack. "It is not," he says, "I assure you, a "pleasant thing to be stretched on the rack till the body becomes "almost two feet longer than nature made it."—If we may believe him, Stubbs supplied the materials of his book, and Wilkinson added the marginal notes. Hopton, lieutenant of the Tower, inserted in his confession names that he had never heard, and suppressed some and altered others of his answers. See his letters in Bridgewater, 230—234; also Bartoli, 119, 137, 138.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1582.

naturally led to persecution, that the Catholic worship was idolatry; and that even to connive at idolatry was a damnable crime, which could not fail to draw down the severest judgments of Heaven, both on the queen and the nation.[1]

III. There was nothing in the creeds of the Puritans or of the Catholics which, according to law, could subject them to the pains of heresy; but the Anabaptists were still doomed to suffer at the stake under Elizabeth, as their predecessors had suffered under her father and brother. They formed a numerous sect in the maritime provinces of the Netherlands, and under the cover of the Dutch church in London, occasionally introduced themselves into England. On three different occasions, the queen, by proclamation, ordered all persons, whether foreigners or natives, who had embraced the opinions of the Anabaptists, to leave the kingdom within twenty days, under pain of forfeiture, imprisonment, and other penalties. At the suggestion of Grindall, bishop of London, domiciliary visits were made through all the parishes of the metropolis; and every householder was compelled to return a list of the strangers who lodged with him, their occupations, characters, and religious principles.[2] In 1574 Sandys, his successor, delivered sixteen Anabaptists to the lord mayor, to be transported out of the kingdom;

[1] Mr. Hallam remarks, as an extenuating circumstance distinguishing this persecution from that of Mary and of the house of Austria that no woman was put to death under the penal code, so far as he remembers.—Const. Hist. i. 197, note. The fact, however, is, that Margaret Clitheroe was executed in 1586, Margaret Ward in 1588, and Anne Line in 1601. Mrs. Wells received sentence of death in 1591, and died in prison. Four other Catholic gentlewomen were condemned at different times, but reprieved; two of whom obtained a pardon from James I.—Challoner, vol. i. 189, 222, 296.

[2] Strype's Grindall, 122—124.

the next year, on Easter-day, twenty-seven others were apprehended, by his order, at their devotions in a house near Aldgate; and the queen issued a commission to him and the bishop of Rochester, the master of the Rolls, and two magistrates, to proceed against them as suspected of heresy. On examination, it was found that they rejected the baptism of infants, denied that Christ assumed flesh of the Virgin, and taught that no Christian ought to take an oath, or to accept the office of magistrate. Some were dismissed with a reprimand; five, on their repentance, were adjudged to bear fagots, and to recant at St. Paul's Cross; and one woman and ten men were condemned to the flames; of whom the woman saved her life by abjuring her errors; the men, instead of being burnt at the stake, were sent out of the kingdom.[1] But neither argument nor terror could subdue the obstinacy of Peeters and Turwert, who persisted in maintaining the truth of their doctrines. The queen, calling to mind "that she was head of the church, that "it was her duty to extirpate error, and that heretics "ought to be cut off from the flock of Christ, that "they may not corrupt others,"[2] signed a warrant to the sheriffs; and the two unfortunate men perished in the flames of Smithfield, amidst the applause of an immense concourse of spectators. Four years afterwards, for the profession of similar opinions, Matthew Hammond, a ploughwright, who had been pronounced an obstinate heretic by the bishop of Norwich, was burnt in the ditch of that city; and in the same place, but after an interval of ten years, was also consumed Francis Kett, a member of one of the universities,

A.D. 1575.

April 3.

July 15.

July 22.

1579. May 20.

[1] Stowe, 678. Wright, ii. 9.

[2] Rymer, xv. 740, 741.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1579.

who had been convicted of uttering blasphemies against the divinity of Christ.[1]

It is now time to return to the unfortunate Mary Stuart. For several years, her adversary Morton, under the powerful shield of Elizabeth, had reigned without control in Scotland, while the captive queen was compelled to suffer all the horrors of a rigorous and protracted imprisonment in the castle at Sheffield.[2] The number of her attendants was diminished, the allowance for her table reduced; her correspondence was intercepted and detained by the agents of the ministers; and foreigners, frequently even the French ambassador, were refused access to her presence. She was never permitted to quit her own apartments, unless it were for the purpose of walking in the courtyard or on the leads; and then an hour's previous notice of her intention was required, that the earl or his countess might accompany her. So rigorous a confinement, joined with the anxiety resulting from her ignorance of the passing events in which she might be deeply interested, rapidly impaired her health, till she was compelled through weakness to pass most of her time in bed, and was removed in a chair whenever she wished to change her apartment. Elizabeth, though she graciously accepted from her captive presents of needlework and of Parisian dresses, invariably eluded or rejected every petition for a mitigation of the severity of her confinement.[3]

But if Mary suffered, her royal oppressor was not free from uneasiness. She had now convinced her-

[1] Stowe, 679, 685. Collier, 569.
[2] She had been placed there in December, 1570.
[3] Lodge, ii. 87, 121, 129.

self that her own safety was irreconcilable with the deliverance or the escape of the Scottish queen; and the fear of the latter event proved to her an exhaustless source of apprehension, of jealousy, and of torment. Among the nobility there was no one in whom she reposed greater confidence than the earl of Shrewsbury. Yet she mistrusted even him. She had been formerly warned of the "alluring graces" of Mary;[1] and she feared that he might be seduced from her service by the attractions of her rival. He was frequently reprimanded for his supposed negligence; at her recommendation he was compelled to take into his household persons whom he knew to be spies upon his conduct; and, while he guarded Mary Stuart, he was himself surrounded with guards, the secret agents of the queen, in the neighbourhood of his residence.[2]

But, what will probably appear still more extraordinary, Burghley himself, the sworn enemy of Mary, the author of most of her wrongs, and the adviser of her death, could not escape the jealousy of his mistress. On two occasions he had recourse to the waters of Buxton to relieve the gout. Elizabeth persuaded herself that the real object of his journeys was to find occasion of intriguing secretly with Mary. She opened to him her suspicion; reprimanded him in a tone of extreme severity, and was long before she would give credit to his repeated denials of the charge.[3]

[1] Haynes, 511. She "doubted lest her fayre speche shuld "dysseave him."—Lodge, ii. 156.

[2] Lodge, ii. 83, 85, 116, 163, 275. When his daughter-in-law was confined, he christened the child himself, that he might not be accused of introducing strangers, if he had sent for a clergyman (128).

[3] Lodge, ii. 131, 132. To illustrate the system of espionage which prevailed at this period, Burghley, though in reality prime

CHAP. V. A.D. 1579.

On the part of the Scottish adherents of the captive, the English queen was free from alarm, so long as Morton retained the regency. But his rapacity had excited the murmurs, and his submission to Elizabeth had wounded the pride, of the nation. The former prompted him to debase the coin, to multiply the forfeitures of real or pretended transgressors, and to appropriate to his own benefit the property of the church; the latter induced him to humble himself to the lieutenant of the queen of England, in satisfaction for some unintentional offence, arising out of an affray on the borders. At length the earls of Argyle and Athol obtained access to the young king; and James, by their persuasion, though he was but twelve years old, assumed the government, summoned the noblemen of their party to meet him in Stirling,

1578. March 12. and sent to Morton an order to resign his authority. He obeyed with apparent cheerfulness; but in two months his intrigues with the family of Erskine intro-

May 8. duced him into the castle of Stirling, gave him possession of the royal person, and enabled him, as head of

July 16. the council, to resume the power which he had lost.

August 13. The two parties met with hostile intentions in the field; they were reconciled by the intervention of the

1579. April 28. English ambassador, and Athol, the chief author of the regent's late disgrace, after an entertainment at Morton's table, died in a few days of poison. Secure of the ascendancy, he now gave the reins to his avarice

minister, having occasion to write a confidential letter to the earl of Shrewsbury on some domestic arrangements, was compelled to keep it by him an entire week, before he found a messenger to whom he dared to trust it, through the danger of its being intercepted and sent to the queen (134). "Who will write, when his letters shall be "opened by the way and construed at pleasure, or rather displea-"sure?"—Harington to Standen, February 20, 1600. Nugæ Ant. i. 309; also 314, 318.

and resentment; and the chiefs of the Hamiltons, who reposed in security under the protection of the treaty of Perth, were compelled to save their lives by a speedy flight into England. Before this, however, had appeared an unexpected rival to awaken his jealousy. Esmé Stuart, lord of Aubigny, and nephew of Lennox, the former regent, arrived from France; his youth and accomplishments captivated James; and the new favourite was created first earl, then duke of Lennox, and loaded with honours and appointments. He not only insinuated to the king that it was the object of Morton to convey him into England; but sent to France for evidence to prove that Morton had been an accomplice in the murder of Darnley. Morton, on his side, published that Lennox was in reality an agent of the duke of Guise; that the object of his mission was to effect a change of the national religion, to marry James to some foreign princess, and to persuade him to resign the sceptre into the hands of his mother. The English cabinet, alarmed for the safety, or believing the representations, of their friend, sent Sir Robert Bowes as ambassador to require the banishment of Lennox; but he returned without an audience, because he refused to deliver his message to the king in presence of the accused. A Scottish ambassador, sent to apologize for this conduct, met with similar treatment, and was remanded with a sharp expostulation and supercilious admonition from Burghley, in the name of Elizabeth.[1]

CHAP. V. A.D. 1579. — Nov. 10. September 1580. March 5 Sept. 12.

Lennox, however, was not to be deterred from his purpose by the frown of the English queen. One

[1] Camden, 364. The Bowes Correspondence, 83—142, 156.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1580.

day, when the young king was seated at the board with his council, James Stuart, captain of the guard, and son to Lord Ochiltree, requested permission to speak to his sovereign. Being admitted, he fell on his knees, and accused James, earl of Morton, of having been guilty act and part of the murder of the king's father. Morton treated the charge and its author with sovereign contempt. But Stuart replied in language equally bold and abusive; the parties became heated; swords were drawn, and blood would have been shed, had not the lords interposed, and, forcing them out of the council-chamber by opposite doors, delivered them to the guards. The justice-clerk now delivered his opinion, that an individual accused of treason must be committed till legal inquiry had been made. Morton was accordingly confined in Holyrood House, and then conveyed to

Dec. 31. Dumbarton, of which fortress his enemy Lennox was governor.[1]

1581. Jan. 18.

Randolph, the celebrated sower of sedition and treason, was immediately despatched to Edinburgh. He solicited the life of Morton from the king, the council, and the estates; he described it as a favour which the queen deserved in return for the numerous benefits which she had conferred upon the nation; he attributed the charge to the jealousy of a rival; and he produced documents to prove that Lennox had associated with foreign princes to procure the inva-

Feb. 7. sion of England. He received for answer that his documents were forgeries, and that the king was bound in honour to let the trial proceed. Elizabeth ordered a body of English troops to march to the

[1] Bowes Correspondence, 157, 161.

borders;[1] and Randolph exhorted the earls of Angus and Marr, and the other lords in the English interest, to unsheathe the sword in defence of their leader. Nor was he the only person employed to plead in favour of Morton, and to denounce the pernicious plans of Lennox. The prince of Orange commissioned William Melville, the king of Navarre, Bothwell, and Wemyss, to support the representations of the English agent. But James was inexorable. He summoned all his subjects to arms in defence of their country; the earl of Angus was ordered to retire beyond the Spey, and Marr to surrender the castle of Stirling. Stuart, the accuser, was created earl of Arran; and Randolph, who had, in two former missions, been sent out of the country, now fled to preserve his life.[2] The queen, unable to raise up a formidable party in Scotland, and ashamed to make war for the sole purpose of preventing the course of public justice, recalled her forces.

CHAP V. A.D. 1581.

March 24.

May 1.

The proofs against Morton consisted of verbal and written evidence. The object of the first was to show that he had held a consultation respecting the murder of Darnley at Whittingham; that, when it was perpetrated, his cousin and confidential friend Archibald Douglas and his servant Binning were actually employed; and that Queen Mary, when she

June 1.

[1] "Two thousand foot, five hundred horse, for relief of *hir partie* "in Scotland, and (if) need be."—Walsingham to Sir Henry Sydney, February 28, 1581. The reader will notice "hir partie." —Sydney Papers, i. 286.

[2] See his letter to the chancellor in Strype, ii. App. 138. He says of Morton, "Nay, I cannot myself wish him any favour, if "that be true that is said of him, and confessed by them in whom "he had no small trust." It appears that he was accused not only of the death of Darnley, but of poisoning the earl of Athol, and of intending to imprison the king, and to kill Argyle, Lennox, and Montrose.—Ibid.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1581.

surrendered at Carberry Hill, told him to his face that he was one of the assassins. The written evidence was his own bond of manrent, or bond to save Bothwell from the punishment of murder, produced by Sir James Balfour, and a paper purporting to be the declaration of Bothwell himself on his death-bed in Denmark.[1] He was found guilty by the unanimous verdict of his peers; but the punishment of treason was commuted by the king into decapitation. In his prison he confessed to the ministers who attended him (but at the same time refused to sign the confession), that he had been twice solicited by Bothwell, twice by Archibald Douglas, to take an active part in the projected murder; that he had declined it, because, though Bothwell alleged the consent of the queen, he could produce no written proof of that consent; but that he was guilty of having concealed, through fear, his knowledge of the conspiracy, and of having given to Bothwell, first the bond of manrent, and afterwards

[1] Consult Camden, 368; Arnot, Criminal Trials, 388; and Foster's letter in Chalmers, ii. 97. From the last, it appears that a declaration of Bothwell was produced at the trial. Bothwell died in 1576. A report prevailed, that on his death-bed he had solemnly declared Mary innocent of the murder, and named his real accomplices. She made attempts to procure a copy of this testament, as it was called; one was believed to have been sent by the king of Denmark to Elizabeth, who suppressed it; another was supposed to have made its way into the Scottish court. That published by Keith deserves no credit. From internal evidence, it is nothing more than a memorandum made by some nameless person, at least five years after the death of Bothwell, of what had been reported by a Danish merchant soon after his death.—Keith, App. 142—145. Camden asserts that the earl often, both during his life and at his death, declared upon oath the innocence of Mary: "et vivens et moriens reginam minime consciam fuisse, "religiosa asseveratione sæpenumero contestatus est."—Camd. 143. But Laing is positive that King James inserted this passage, and that it was not originally written by Camden.—Laing, ii. 52. His assertion is merely conjecture; but, if the fact were so, might not James have learned it during his residence in Denmark?

another bond to promote his marriage with the queen.[1] On the scaffold he threw himself on his face, and, by sobs and groans and violent contortions of the body, manifested the agitation and anguish of his mind. What impression the sight made on the spectators, we know not; but the ministers who attended him assure us that these things "were evident signs of the in-"ward and mighty working of the spirit of God."[2] Binning suffered the next day; Archibald Douglas, whom Morton had appointed a lord of session, found an asylum in England.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1581

Ever since the arrival of Lennox, Elizabeth had watched with additional jealousy the conduct of the Scottish queen; after the fall of Morton, she thought it necessary to come to a final determination respecting the fate of her captive. Was Mary, as had been formerly devised, to be prosecuted and attainted for

[1] It is singular, that after all the investigations and executions which had taken place, it was still, fourteen years after the death of Darnley, a question in what manner he was murdered. Morton was asked "whidder the king was wirriet or blawin in the aire?" He called God to witness that he did not know.—Bannatyne, 498.

[2] "He lay on griefe upon his face befoir the place of executione, "his bodie making grit rebounding with sychis and sobbes, quhilk "are evident signes of the inward and myghtie working of the "speirt of God."—See the whole confession, and the sequel, in Bannatyne's Journal, 494—517. It has been contended, that in this confession, published by the ministers, much was omitted out of tenderness to characters then living, or for political purposes. Mary, indeed, in a letter to Elizabeth, roundly asserts that, from the deposition of Morton, and from the depositions of those confronted with him, it was plain that all her misfortunes, during her residence in Scotland, were caused by the suggestions and promises of the agents of the English queen: "à dire, faire, entreprendre, "et executer ce que durant mes troubles est advenu audit pays." —Jebb, ii. 266. Camden, 387. Camden also informs us that, according to Morton's real confession, he refused to act in the murder without a note from the queen; and Bothwell replied that such a note could not be procured, because the murder must be perpetrated without her knowledge.—Camden, 143.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1581. September

practices against the life and dignity of the English queen; or was she to be liberated from prison on conditions calculated to secure Elizabeth from the dangers which she feared? The lords of the council assembled; and three days were spent in deliberation. But, whatever had been the previous wish of the queen, she soon began to waver; she made objections to every proposal; and at last had recourse to the expedient, so familiar to weak minds, of freeing herself from present perplexity by postponing her resolution to a later period. When that period arrived, the same indecision prevailed; Mary was harassed with additional questions and fresh demands. The partisans of Elizabeth again acquired the ascendancy in Scotland; and new events furnished new reasons for perpetuating the captivity of the Scottish queen.

To the Catholics of England the late revolution in Scotland had opened a cheering though fallacious prospect. Groaning under the pressure of penal statutes, and despairing of relief from the reigning sovereign, they naturally looked forward to the prince who, in all probability, would, within the space of a few years, succeed to the English throne. By the known hostility of Morton, they had been hitherto deterred from presenting themselves to the notice of the Scottish king; the opposite policy of D'Aubigny encouraged them to assure him of their attachment to the claim of the house of Stuart; to solicit his protection in favour of their brethren, whom persecution might occasionally drive into Scotland; and to express a hope that, when Providence should place the sceptre in his hands, he would extend the benefit of religious toleration to the best friends of his mother

and of himself. Persons, the Jesuit, carried his views much further. He argued that, though the prince had been educated by the disciples of Knox, his conversion to the worship of his fathers was not improbable. He was only in his fifteenth year. Who could presume to foresee what impression might hereafter be made on his mind by gratitude and interest, by affection for his mother, and by his own reading and reflection? With these hopes he despatched, first, Waytes, an English clergyman, afterwards Creighton, a Scottish Jesuit, to the court at Holyrood House. They were received with kindness by the king, the duke of Lennox, the earls of Huntley, Eglinton, and Caithness, and by the barons Seton, Ogilby, Gray, and Ferniherst; and both returned to Persons with flattering, though perhaps insincere, promises of the royal favour. James was willing to connive at the silent introduction of the Catholic missionaries, to receive one into his court as his tutor in the Italian language, and to take under his protection such religious refugees as should bring with them a recommendation from his mother. He also talked of the filial affection which he felt towards that unfortunate princess, of his sense of the many wrongs which she had suffered, and of his readiness to co-operate in any plan for her deliverance from captivity; but unfortunately (so he pretended) his enemies had deprived him of the means; he was a king without a revenue; and poverty would at last compel him, unless he were relieved by the bounty of the Catholic princes, to submit to the pleasure of Elizabeth.

1582. May.

With this answer Persons and Creighton hastened to Paris, where they met the duke of Guise, Castelli the papal nuncio, Tassis the Spanish ambassador,

CHAP. V. A.D. 1582. Beaton the archbishop of Glasgow and Mary's resident in the French court, Matthieu the provincial of the French Jesuits, and Dr. Allen the president of the seminary at Rheims. After a long and secret consultation, the general opinion was, that Mary and James ought to be associated on the Scottish throne, as joint king and queen; that to consolidate their interests, an agreement between them, consisting of several articles,[1] should be signed; and that the pope and the king of Spain should be solicited to relieve the present pecuniary wants of the young king. It is probable that other projects, with which we are unacquainted, were also formed. Whatever they were, June 18. they afterwards obtained the assent of the Scottish cabinet; Persons hastened to Valladolid, where he obtained from Philip a present of twelve thousand crowns for James; and Creighton to Rome, where the pope promised to pay the expenses of his bodyguard for twelve months, amounting to one-third of the former sum.[2]

When this plan of association was communicated to Mary, she not only gave her own consent, but earnestly solicited that of her son. It was her wish, she said, to give him, according to law, what he now held only by force; to make him, an usurper as he now was, a legitimate king in the estimation of other sovereigns. By Lennox and Arran the measure was

[1] The purport of the articles was to relieve all Scotsmen from any fear of punishment for past offences, and to secure to them their present rights and possessions—"d'asseurer les rebelles de toute "impunité de leurs offences du passé, et de remettre toutes choses "en repos pour l'advenir sans aucune innovation de chose quel-"conque."—Lettres de Marie, Jebb, ii. 274.

[2] See the letters of Persons in More, 113, 121; Bartoli, 242, 244; and the supplication of the Scottish malcontents in Melville, 130.

approved; but, if the former supported it with all his influence, the latter secretly opposed every obstacle in his power. At the first proposal James was alarmed; but when he was assured that Mary would leave to him the sole exercise of the sovereign authority within the realm, he signified his assent. The captive queen fondly attributed it to the affection of the son for his mother; the result showed that it had been drawn from him by considerations of personal interest.[1] CHAP. V. A.D. 1582.

Neither the visits of Waytes and Creighton to Edinburgh, nor the consultation in Paris, had escaped the prying curiosity of the English agents; and all the projects of Persons were extinguished in their very birth by the promptitude and policy of Elizabeth's cabinet. Under its auspices a new revolution was organized in Scotland.[2] The earl of Gowrie invited James to his castle of Ruthven, secured the person of the unsuspecting prince, and assumed with his associates the exercise of the royal authority. Of the former ministers, the earl of Arran was thrown into prison, and the duke of Lennox sought an asylum in France, where he died of poison or of a broken heart.[3] The Scottish lords of the English faction ruled again without control; and the preachers from Aug. 23.

[1] Cotton MSS. Cal. B. iv. 35.

[2] In proof of it, Mary, in her letter to Elizabeth, appeals to the charges "données à vos derniers deputez envoyez en Escosse, et "ce que lesdits deputez y ont seditieusment practiqué avec bonne et "suffisante solicitation du comte mon bon voisin à York" (Huntingdon).—Jebb, ii. 270. See also Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 97.

[3] He was said, probably on very slight grounds, to have been poisoned in his passage through England. See a letter from Mary in Jebb, ii. 537. Mary's agent in Scotland asserts that the real cause of his exile was his approval of the plan of association: "Il ne "fust jamais chassé pour aultre occasion, que d'avoir pourchassé la "dite association."—Murdin, 549.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1582.

the pulpit pointed the resentment of their hearers against the men who had sought to restore an idolatrous worship, and to replace an adulteress and assassin on the throne.

For several weeks, the Scottish queen was kept in close confinement, that this unexpected event, so fatal to her hopes, might be concealed from her knowledge. When the communication was at last made, it alarmed her maternal tenderness; she read in her own history the fate which awaited her son; and from her bed-chamber, to which she was confined by sickness, wrote to Elizabeth a long and most eloquent remonstrance. Having requested the queen to accompany her in imagination to the throne of the Almighty, their common judge, she enumerated the wrongs which she had suffered from her English sister while she reigned in Scotland, on her flight into England, after her innocence had been proved in the conferences at York and Westminster, and now, last of all, in the captivity of her son.[1] But what injury had she offered

Nov. 8.

[1] In this letter Mary mentions several facts of great historical importance. She states—1. That during her imprisonment at Lochlevin, she received more than one letter from the English queen, inviting her to flee to England for protection, and promising to meet her with an English army at the borders. One of these letters was accompanied with a diamond ring, to be kept by her as a token or pledge of Elizabeth's sincerity. Mary contrived to escape, and from the field of Langside, aware of the uncertainty of an appeal to arms, she sent back to the queen by a special messenger this very ring to remind her of her promise. These facts fully explain why she afterwards, in opposition to the advice of her best friends, determined to pass the Solway Frith and land in England. She states—2. That, if she consented to marry the duke of Norfolk, it was at the suggestion of the councillors the most trusted by Elizabeth, and that their signatures to the suggestion are still in existence, to be exhibited when called for. 3. That by the inquiry, which the presumption of her enemies had provoked during the conferences at Westminster, the falsehood and forgery of the documents circulated against her had been completely exposed.

to Elizabeth to justify such conduct? Let the charge be made, and, if she did not refute it, she was willing to suffer the punishment. She knew her real and her only crime. It was that she was the nearest relation, the next heir to the queen. But her enemies had little reason to be alarmed. They had brought her to the brink of the grave, and she thought little now of any other kingdom than the kingdom of God. In this situation, therefore, she recommended the interests of her son to the protection of her good sister, and earnestly begged for her own liberation from prison. But, if she must remain a captive, she trusted that at least the queen would grant her a Catholic clergyman to prepare her soul for death, and two additional female servants to attend on her during her sickness.[1] Whether this energetic appeal made any impression on the heart of Elizabeth we know not; it procured no additional indulgence to the royal captive.

For some time the queen and Henry of France had stood in mutual awe of each other. *She* feared that he might be provoked to espouse the cause of Mary;

(La verité estant apparue des impostures qu'on semoit de moi (Lettres, v. 323), evidently means that the truth of her plea, that they were impostures or forgeries, was too manifest to be denied.) 4. That the late revolution in Scotland, by which her son was made a prisoner in the hands of Gowrie, had been brought about by the intrigues of Elizabeth's agents and by the distribution of Elizabeth's gold. If we recollect that Mary's object was to propitiate the English queen, we must conclude that she would not have presumed to make such statements unless she had known that Elizabeth was conscious of their truth; and, if that was the case we may discover in such consciousness the real reason why, during so many years, Mary could never obtain a personal interview with the English queen.

[1] This letter is abridged by Camden (p. 387), but published entire by Jebb, ii. 266; and more correctly by Prince Labanoff, v. 318.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1582.

he, that at the first offence she would lend her powerful aid to the French Huguenots. On this account, as long as James suffered himself to be guided by the duke of Lennox, Henry appeared indifferent to the affairs of Scotland; but now that the Scottish king was in the hands of the English faction, La Motte Fenelon and Maigneville were despatched to Edinburgh, that they might aid the young prince to regain his liberty, advise him to call around him the other noblemen and the deputies of the burghs, and suggest the necessity of effecting as quickly as possible the association of his mother with himself on the throne.

1583. Jan. 13. At the same time, Bowes and Davidson, the English, were instructed to oppose the French agents; to urge their immediate dismissal; and to represent to the king the danger of the measures which they recommended.[1] James acted with a dissimulation and vigour not to be expected from his years. Having

June 27. summoned a convention of noblemen at St. Andrew's, he took possession of the castle; the number of his adherents intimidated the opposite faction; an offer of pardon to all who had been concerned "in the raid "of Ruthven" allayed their apprehensions; and the young king recovered with ease the exercise of the royal authority. Elizabeth by letter condemned, James defended or excused, his conduct, and, during the controversy, to the surprise of all men, Walsing-

Sept. 1. ham himself made his appearance at the Scottish court. There seemed no sufficient object to draw that aged statesman from his official situation, and to

[1] See the instructions in Murdin, 374; Camden, 395. At Leith they procured the arrest of Holt, a Jesuit, on his way to Rome with despatches from Lord Seton, but do not appear to have drawn any important disclosure from him.—Wright, ii. 189.

engage him in so long and laborious a journey. He read, however, to the Scottish king several lectures on the art of government; extolled clemency as more useful than rigour; and exhorted James to banish "the enemies of the religion" from his councils and his society. But the chief occupation of the ambassador was to study the numbers and resources of the two parties; to spread distrust and dissension in the one, while he united and strengthened the other; to distribute with discretion the moneys which he had brought with him from England, and to secure partisans with pensions and promises. James had received him coldly, and listened to him with reserve; Sept. 15. a paltry present at his departure proved how little the king valued his advice; and Elizabeth complained to Mary of the disrespect shown to her ambassador, which she resented as shown to herself.[1]

Bowes had at the same time been engaged in an intrigue, the failure of which proved an equal disappointment to the English queen. She had long sought to obtain possession of the casket containing the supposed letters and sonnets of Mary Stuart to Bothwell; but though her expectation of success had been often raised to the highest point, she had as often been deceived by the backslidings of men unable or unwilling to comply with their engagements. About the end of 1582 Bowes was ordered to renew the attempt, under instructions from that master of intrigue, the English secretary. Bowes discovered that the casket was in the hands of Gowrie; he employed "fit instruments"—who or what they were is not mentioned; but at last confessed that it was not

[1] Camden, 396, 397. Melville, 135. Sadler, ii. 374. Jebb, ii 535, 536.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1583.

in his power "to win the same out of Gowrie's hands "without his own consent or privity." He was obliged to break the matter to the earl openly; they held three conferences together. But no argument, nor promise, nor even the loan of a large sum of money, could subdue the stubbornness of the Scotsman, who declared that documents so necessary for the defence of his party against the charge of having dethroned their sovereign should never with his consent be taken out of the kingdom. Mary at the same time demanded of her son that the same documents, being forgeries, should be either destroyed or delivered up to her.[1]

The new revolution in Scotland had revived the hopes of the royal captive and of her adherents in France. The duke of Guise, Castelli, the archbishop of Glasgow, Matthieu, and Morgan held another meeting at Paris. The object of their present consultation was to devise a plan for the liberation of Mary; and it was proposed that the duke should land with an army in the south of England; that James with a Scottish force should enter the northern counties; and that the English friends of the house of Stuart should be summoned to the aid of the injured queen. This project was communicated to Mary through the French ambassador, to James through Holt, the English Jesuit, confined in the castle of Edinburgh.[2] The king immediately expressed his

[1] See the Bowes Correspondence, published by the Surtees Society, p. 236, 240, 253, 264.

[2] See Murdin, 496. With all the persons at this consultation the reader is acquainted, except Morgan. He was a gentleman of Wales, formerly secretary to Mary, and now administrator, with Charles Paget, brother to Lord Paget, of her dower in France. The archbishop of Glasgow distrusted or disliked them both. From

assent; but his mother, aware that her keepers had orders to deprive her of life if any attempt were made to carry her away by force, sought rather to obtain her liberty by concession and negotiation. She acquainted Elizabeth with her design of transferring all her rights to her son; threw the blame of his late behaviour to Walsingham on the ministers, who abused his good-nature and inexperience; repeated the offers which she had made the year before; and proposed a league of perpetual amity between the two crowns, to be concluded in Scotland, through the mediation of Castelnau, the French ambassador. Elizabeth seemed to acquiesce; the English ministers submitted to the pleasure of their sovereign; and Castelnau predicted a favourable result. But it was the misfortune of Mary to depend on men who were swayed by no other consideration than personal interest. Though Henry had authorized the ambassador to undertake the commission, though he furnished him with instructions such as the Scottish queen had solicited, yet he privately admonished him to obstruct any treaty which, by freeing Elizabeth from apprehension on the part of Scotland, might place her at liberty to support the Protestants of France.[1] Castelnau deemed it prudent to relax his exertions; Dec. 19. the Scots of the English faction argued the point with the queen; reports were circulated of the projected invasion; and Elizabeth was taught to believe that the discharge of the captive must prove injurious to her honour and interests; to her honour, because her Scottish friends would infallibly be sacrificed to

the former consultation they had been excluded. How Morgan came to be admitted to this, I know not.

[1] See his letter in Jebb, ii. 545.

CHAP. V.
A.D. 1583.

the resentment of Mary; to her interests, because the mother and son would probably devote themselves to the cause of Spain, the former by a marriage with Philip, the latter by a marriage with the daughter of that monarch. Elizabeth, with her characteristic inconstancy, changed her resolution, and the cup of promise was again, for the twentieth time, dashed from the lips of Mary Stuart.[1]

But the English queen herself experienced at this period considerable disquietude, from her knowledge of the design of the duke of Guise, combined with her ignorance of his associates and resources. She not only suspected the captive at Sheffield; she dreaded the disaffection of her subjects of the Catholic communion. During the last two years, the laws against them had been enforced with unexampled severity. The scaffolds were repeatedly drenched with the blood of priests executed as traitors; and in several counties the prisons were crowded with recusants of ancient and noble families. In the event of invasion, could she rely on the loyalty of men suffering under such oppression? Would they not imitate the Protestants of Scotland, France, and the Netherlands, who had risen in arms against their Catholic sovereigns? To discover the extent of the danger, and to guard against the designs of the disaffected, her chief dependence was on the industry and ingenuity of Walsingham, who, nurtured in intrigue himself, was the better qualified to detect and unravel the intrigues of others. Secret agents in his pay were spread over the continent. They resided in the most frequented ports, insinuated themselves into the councils of princes, and even studied

[1] Jebb, ii. 532, 545.

as ecclesiastics in the English seminaries. Other spies at home, prompted by the prospect of reward, haunted the houses of the principal Catholics. They represented themselves as confidential agents of Mary or of her partisans, delivered counterfeit letters, that they might receive answers, and sought, by every artifice, to discover the secret dispositions of men, or to allure them to the commission of crime. It became, according to the testimony of Camden, difficult for the most loyal and the most cautious to elude the snares which were laid for their destruction.[1] The first victim was Arden, a gentleman of an ancient family in Warwickshire, whose misfortune it was to have incurred the enmity of Leicester, by refusing to sell a portion of his estate for the accommodation of that powerful favourite. In the progress of the quarrel he had the imprudence to brave the resentment of his antagonist; he rejected the earl's livery, which was worn by the neighbouring gentlemen; he opposed him in all his pursuits in the county, and was accustomed to speak of him with contempt as an upstart, an adulterer, and a tyrant. Arden's daughter had married Somerville, a neighbouring Catholic, subject to fits of insanity. In one of these he attacked, with a drawn sword, two men on the highway; and, at the same time, declared, so it was reported, that he would murder every Protestant, and the queen as their head. Somerville was soon lodged in the Tower; and in a few days was followed by his father and mother-in-law, his wife, his sister, and Hall, a missionary priest. Arden and Hall were put to the torture; the former persisted in maintaining his innocence; from the latter was drawn a confession that Arden had, in

CHAP. V. A.D. 1583.

Oct. 30.

Nov. 24.

[1] Camden, 411.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1583. his hearing, wished the queen were in heaven. On this slender proof, conjoined with the previous conduct of Somerville, that gentleman, Hall, Arden, and Arden's wife, were convicted of a conspiracy to kill the queen. Somerville, on pretence of insanity, was Dec. 19. removed to Newgate, and found, within two hours, strangled in his cell; Arden, the next day, suffered the punishment of a traitor. The justice of his execution was generally questioned; and the pardon granted to the others strengthened the belief that his blood was to be charged not to his guilt, but to the vengeance of Leicester, who gave the lands of his victim to one of his own dependants.[1]

About the same time, if the information received by Walsingham were correct, Charles Paget, an exile, and brother to the lord Paget, ventured to land on the coast of Sussex, under the assumed name of Mope. Soon afterwards a letter, written by Morgan, fell into Nov. 17. the hands of the secretary. Francis and George, sons of Sir John Throckmorton, whom the hostility of Leicester had, on some trifling pretext, removed from his office of chief justice of Chester, were immediately apprehended and sent to the Tower; the lord Paget and Charles Arundel fled beyond the sea;[2] and the earl of Northumberland with his son, and the earl of Arundel with his countess, uncle, and brother, were 1584. Jan. 1. summoned and repeatedly examined before the council. These, if they did not convince, at least silenced, their adversaries. Paget and Arundel protested that they

[1] Camden, 405. Bridgewater, 317. Rishton's Diarium. Dugdale's Warwickshire, 681. About the same time (January 11) was executed Carter, a printer. He was charged with having printed a treatise on schism, in which the maids of honour were exhorted to kill the queen, as Judith had killed Holofernes.—Camden, 411. I shall transcribe the passage in note (P), at the end of the volume.

[2] Arundel had lent money to the queen of Scots.—Murdin, 438.

had fled, not through consciousness of guilt, but to elude the snares laid for them by the cunning and malice of Leicester.[1] Even the two Throckmortons persisted in the most solemn asseverations of their innocence. In the meanwhile Stafford, the ambassador in France, had laboured, but in vain, to discover some trace of the projected invasion. Not a single soldier was levied; no preparation whatever had been made.[2] But, if his report contributed to lull, an intercepted, and in all probability forged, letter from the Scottish court to Mary awakened the apprehensions of Elizabeth. The writer informed the royal captive that James approved the plan of the duke of Guise, was resolved to expose his own person in the attempt, had received a promise of twenty thousand crowns to raise an army, and was desirous of knowing on what English noblemen and gentlemen he might rely for assistance.[3] It was probably owing to this letter that Francis Throckmorton was brought to trial. He had thrice suffered the rack without making any disclosure; when he was again led to that engine of torture, he confessed that two catalogues, said to have been found in one of his trunks, had been written by him; that one contained the names of the chief ports, the other of the principal Catholics in England; that they were intended for

April 4.

[1] Camden, 411. Hardwicke Papers, i. 213.

[2] Hardwicke Papers, i. 197. Murdin, 389, 397. It is plain, from the letters of Henry III. to his ambassador in England, that he was resolved to preserve peace with Elizabeth; but to her demand that he should deliver to her the Pagets, Arundel, Morgan, &c., he replied that they were exiles on account of religion, and that she had never given up to him the rebels who sought protection from her; but that, if any Englishmen in France could be proved to have conspired against her, he would punish them to her satisfaction.—Egerton, 25, 26.

[3] See it in Sadler's Papers, ii. 375.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1584.

the use of Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador, to further the enterprise of the duke of Guise; and that he had devised a plan with that minister to enable the Catholics, at the moment of invasion, to levy troops in the name of the queen, then to declare against her, and, unless she would consent to tolerate the Catholic worship, to attempt the subversion of the government.[1] With this confession in his hand, Burghley accused the Spaniard of having violated his duty and practised against the state. Mendoza replied, with warmth, that the charge was false and calumnious; that he was the person who had to complain of insidious and traitorous policy; and that Burghley had intercepted the treasure, aided the rebels, and, by the means of pirates, plundered the subjects of his sovereign. The two ministers parted in anger; and the Spaniard, spontaneously, or by force, leaving the court, retired to Paris, where, for many years, he gratified his resentment, by lending the aid of his influence and abilities to those who sought the ruin of Elizabeth.[2]

Throckmorton, on his trial, pleaded that his confession was insufficient to convict him, because, by the thirteenth of the queen, it was required that the indictment should be laid within six months after the commission of the offence, and should also be proved by the oaths of two witnesses. The judges replied that he was indicted, not on the thirteenth of the queen, but on the ancient statute of treasons, which neither required witnesses, nor limited the time of prosecution. Surprised at this answer, he exclaimed

[1] Somers' Tracts, i. p. 214.

[2] Consult Elizabeth's declaration in Strype, iii. 153; App. 43. Among other things, Mendoza charged a certain counsellor (Leicester) with having engaged the brother of a certain earl (Sussex) in a plot to murder Don Juan of Austria.—Ibid.

that he had been deceived; that the whole of his confession was false; that it had been subscribed by him to escape the torment of the rack, and under the impression that it could not affect his life. After condemnation, his life was spared, till he once more confessed his guilt; then he was led to execution: but on the scaffold he again revoked his confession, calling God to witness, that, as it had been extorted from him, in the first instance, by the fear of torture, so it had been drawn from him in the second by the hope of pardon. The government thought proper to publish a tract in justification of his punishment. The proofs which it furnishes might then be deemed sufficient; in the present day they would be rejected with contempt from any court of justice.[1]

A.D. 1584. June 20.

While the ministers thus punished a doubtful conspiracy at home, they were actively employed in fomenting a real conspiracy abroad. Alarmed at the connection of James with the duke of Guise, at his professions of attachment to his mother, and at his marked disregard of the admonitions of Elizabeth, they earnestly sought to restore and to recruit the English faction in Scotland. The intrigues of Walsingham were supported by the gold of the queen;[2] the preachers appealed from their pulpits to the piety or the fanaticism of their hearers; and the chiefs

[1] Camden, 413. Throckmorton was racked for the first time on the 23rd of November, and then twice on the 2nd of December. Several other Catholic gentlemen,—Shelley, Pierpoint, Brummelholme, Layton, &c., were at this time thrown into the Tower, probably on similar charges and suspicions.—See Rishton's Diary at the end of Sanders.

[2] "Ses mauvaises subjects paissez par la bonne royne d'Angle-"terre, cherchent de jour en aultre l'occasion d'avoir sa personne "entre leurs traitereuses mains."—Intercepted letter to Mary, in Sadler, ii. 375.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1584. began to arm their retainers; when the king, who felt his throne tremble under him, commanded, by proclamation, all persons concerned in the "raid of "Ruthven" to quit the realm. Gowrie promised obedience, but loitered, under different pretexts, in the town of Dundee; his accomplices, the earls of Angus and Marr, appeared at the head of a body of insurgents. *He*, after a stubborn conflict, was made prisoner; *they*, though they had surprised the town and the castle of Stirling, abandoned both at the approach of the royal army. Elizabeth had resolved to aid her friends with an English force; but its advance was retarded by a strong remonstrance from the French ambassador; and the design was laid aside at the arrival of intelligence that Gowrie had been executed as a traitor, and that his associates had sought an asylum in England. While Walsingham secretly provided for their support, the queen interceded in their favour; but James, under the direction of Arran, a bold though rapacious minister, rejected her prayer; and the Scottish parliament, having pronounced them rebels, confiscated their property.[1]

March 2.

April 13.

May 4.

Sept. 20.

The cause of Mary had never worn so favourable an appearance as it did at the present moment. The English faction in Scotland was extinct; her son was believed to be at her devotion; Elizabeth, anxious to be freed from apprehension, earnestly sought an agreement; and even Walsingham, now that his other plans had failed, expressed his approbation of the terms offered by the queen of Scots.[2] James had named the master of Marr, one of his favourites, to

Jebb, ii. 548, 553. Sadler, ii. 395, 399, 405. Camden, 408.

[2] "Wherwith I see no cawse but that her majestie shood rest "satysfied."—Sadler, ii. 420.

proceed to the English court; and permission had been obtained that Nau, the French secretary of Mary, should meet him as her agent. Little doubt was entertained that these ministers, through the mediation of the French ambassador, would successfully conclude the treaty so often begun and so often interrupted. But there always happened something to disappoint the expectations of the unfortunate queen. Creighton, the Scottish Jesuit, and Abdy, a Scottish priest, both on their way to their native country, had been captured by a Dutch cruiser; and, though Scotland was not at war with any other power, were conducted as prisoners to England. In the Tower, and in presence of the rack, Creighton disclosed all the particulars of the projected invasion which had so long alarmed Elizabeth.[1] The enemies of Mary improved the opportunity to agitate her mind with new and unfounded apprehensions; and a plan of association was composed, the subscribers of which bound themselves to pursue, unto death, not only every person who should attempt, but also every person in favour of whom any other should attempt, the life of the queen. The latter clause was evidently directed against Mary Stuart; and, while it affected to make the life of one queen security for that of the other, placed the former without resource at the mercy of her enemies, who

A.D. 1584.

Sept. 16

[1] Creighton had torn his papers, and thrown them into the sea, but the fragments were collected, and among them a paper, written in Italian about two years before, showing how England might be successfully invaded.—Sadler, ii. 401. (I suspect a paper in Strype is a translation of it.—Strype, iii. 414.) In his confession he detailed all the particulars of the consultation at Paris; but added, that the invasion was postponed till the troubles in the Low Countries should be ended.—Sadler, ibid. This conduct of Creighton furnished Morgan with a specious ground of complaint against Persons and his friends.—Murdin, 496.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1584. Oct. 31.

might, at any moment, plead a pretended plot in justification of her murder. When the bond of association was read to her, she heard it as her death-warrant; but, recovering herself, she offered to add her signature to the list of subscribers, as far as it were applicable to herself. This offer was not accepted; but copies were dispersed through the kingdom, and were signed by every man who had anything to fear from the displeasure, or anything to hope from the favour, of his sovereign.[1]

It was owing, perhaps, to the peculiar circumstances in which the king of Scotland had been placed from his infancy, or to the education which he had received from his tutors, that he felt none of those generous sentiments which usually glow with so much ardour in the bosom of youth. At the early age of sixteen he was become a perfect master in the art of dissimulation, and knew no other motives of conduct but personal gratification and personal interest. He had long negotiated with his mother, his cousin of Guise, the king of Spain, and the pontiff. To all these he professed a strong partiality for the Catholic worship; a desire to be lawfully associated on the throne with his mother; and a resolution to risk his life in order to procure her liberty. By these protestations he obtained the only thing he sought, repeated presents in money; but his sincerity at last was doubted; their liberality became checked, and he determined to play a similar game with the English queen. Gray, master of Marr, his new ambassador, was ordered not to join the secretary of Mary, but to negotiate apart. Gray professed the Catholic creed, and always held himself out as the devoted servant of

[1] Sadler, ii. 430, 431. Camden, 418.

Mary. He had been sent to Paris with a recommendation to her friends from Holt, and had there been admitted into the confidence of Persons and the archbishop of Glasgow, from whom he learned all their intrigues and plans for the liberation of the Scottish queen. On his introduction to the English court, he was received coldly by Elizabeth, and still more coldly by her ministers. But his conduct soon removed their prejudices against him. He assisted at the established service; he quarrelled with Nau; he betrayed to Elizabeth the secrets which had been intrusted to his fidelity at Paris. When by these arts he had gained the royal favour, he suggested, as the means of "knitting a closer amity," a marriage between the English queen and his sovereign, and demanded for the latter an annual pension, with a declaration that he was the second person in the realm. He could not expect to succeed in all these proposals; but he obtained his principal object, a supply of money, with a promise of more, in proportion to the subsequent services of James.[1] CHAP. V. A.D. 1584.

But though Elizabeth could find money to purchase the friendship of the king, and the services of his favourite, her exchequer was said to be empty; and want, or the apprehension of want, compelled her to make an appeal to the benevolence of her subjects. A new parliament (the last, by successive prorogations, had continued during the space of eleven years) was summoned to meet in the autumn. The more important transactions of the session may be arranged under four distinct heads. 1. A liberal aid was granted of Nov. 23.

[1] Fontenay's account to Mary, in Murdin, 548. 557. Though classed by the editor among the documents of 1586, it belongs to the year 1584.—See also Sadler, ii. 420, 460; Camden, 421.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1584.

six shillings in the pound, by the clergy, to be paid in three years, and of one subsidy and two fifteenths by the temporalty. 2. For the greater safety of the queen, it was proposed that, in case of invasion, or any attempt to injure the royal person, the individual by whom or *for* whom the attempt was made, should forfeit all right to the succession, and should be pursued to death by all the queen's subjects. This bill was plainly the counterpart of the association, and liable to the same objections. Why should Mary, a captive in close confinement, be made to answer, with the loss of her rights and of her life, for the conduct of men whom she had not the power to control, and of whose designs she might probably be ignorant? Elizabeth felt the injustice of the measure; and a royal message was received, suggesting several important amendments. By the act, as it ultimately stood, the associators were restrained from pursuing to the death any person who had not previously been pronounced, by a court of twenty-four commissioners, privy to the treason; Mary and her issue were rendered incapable of the succession, only in the case of the queen suffering a violent death; and the words of the association already subscribed were ordered to be explained according to the provisions of the present statute.[1] 3. The Puritan members among the Commons, though less bold than their predecessors, did not remain silent. Since the last session, the deprivations of nonconforming ministers had been multiplied under the direction of Archbishop Whitgift; the queen had appointed a new ecclesiastical commission with additional and more formidable powers; and the sufferers ceased not to harass both the parliament and convo-

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 703.

cation with long and eloquent petitions for redress. Motions on religious subjects occupied much of the time of the lower house; and bills were introduced to enforce the observance of the sabbath, to repress idleness, incontinence, and adultery, to abolish the administration of the oath ex officio, to regulate proceedings in the bishops' courts, to do away plurality of benefices, and to reform the discipline and morals of the clergy. But the queen still considered every attempt to legislate on ecclesiastical matters as an invasion of her prerogative. By the influence of the court, most of these bills were rejected on the first reading; and of those which passed the Commons, some were thrown out by the Lords, and the others, though they struggled through the house in defiance of the ministers, did not, in any one instance, obtain the royal assent. 4. The Catholics, though hardly a month had been suffered to pass in which the scaffolds did not stream with their blood,[1] were doomed to suffer additional severities. The conspiracies, whether real or pretended, of Arden and Throckmorton, had thrown the nation into a ferment; both the zealots and the alarmists called for measures of precaution and vengeance; and their wishes were amply gratified by a statute which enacted that, if any clergyman born in the queen's dominions, and ordained by authority of the bishop of Rome, were found within the realm after the expiration of forty days, he should be adjudged guilty of high treason; that all persons aiding or receiving him should be liable to the penalties of felony; that whosoever knew of his being in the kingdom, and did not discover him within twelve days, should be fined

[1] During the three last years five-and-twenty had suffered.—Challoner, 69, 163.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1584.

and imprisoned at the queen's pleasure; that all students in the Catholic seminaries, who did not return within six months after proclamation to that effect, should be punished as traitors; that persons supplying them with money in any manner should incur a premunire; that parents sending their children abroad without license should forfeit for every such offence one hundred pounds; and that children so sent to seminaries should be disabled from inheriting the property of their parents.[1]

Dec. 17.

On the third reading of this bill, Dr. Parry, a Welshman and a civilian, rose in his place, and described it "as a measure savouring of treasons, full "of blood, danger, and despair to English subjects, "and pregnant with fines and forfeitures, which would "go to enrich, not the queen, but private individuals." The boldness of this speech, at a time when no other member dared to open his mouth, excited universal astonishment; but the sequel made the conduct of Parry appear still more strange and mysterious. By the house he was given in custody to the serjeant; the next day he obtained his liberty at the command of the queen, who stated that he had explained his motives partly to her satisfaction; and yet, within six weeks afterwards, he was conducted a prisoner to the Tower, on a charge of high treason.[2]

1585. Feb. 2.

Neither the rank nor abilities, the virtues nor vices, of Parry, could entitle him to the notice of posterity; but his real or supposed crime, or rather the use which was made of that crime, has rendered him a distinguished person in the history of this reign. He was a Protestant, born in Wales, of an ancient family by his

[1] Camden, 432. Stat. of Realm, iv 706

[2] D'Ewes's Journal, 310.

own account, of obscure parentage if we may believe others. From the service of the earl of Pembroke he passed to that of the queen; and, by the appointment of Lord Burghley, had resided several years in different parts of the continent, to collect and transmit secret intelligence for the use of that minister. He returned to England, married a rich widow, spent her fortune; and, to extricate himself from debt, broke into the apartment of his principal creditor, whom he attempted to murder, and wounded desperately in the affray. He was saved from the death which he had merited, probably by the influence of his patron, under whose auspices he resumed his former employment of a spy. From the correspondence between them, it appears that both were equally discontented; he with the smallness of his allowance, Burghley with the unimportance of his discoveries. Stimulated by the complaints of the latter, he sought to insinuate himself into the confidence of the Catholic exiles, by pretending to become a convert to their creed; and with that view applied at Lyons to Creighton, with whom the reader is already acquainted. Being reconciled by that Jesuit, he revealed to him his ardent wish to free the English Catholics from the persecution which they suffered; and his readiness to kill the queen with his own hand, if he could only persuade himself that it were lawful before God. Creighton assured him that it was not; Parry began to argue the point; but the Scot was positive, and the next day departed to his usual residence at Chamberry. From Lyons the impostor proceeded to Venice, and addressed himself to Palma, another Jesuit, who refused to listen to his proposals, but conducted him to Campeggio, the papal minister. Parry pretended that he had secrets of

A.D. 1570.

1577

1580.

1582

1583.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1583.

great importance to communicate at Rome, but previously required from the pontiff a passport in the most ample form. Before it arrived, on the receipt of some intelligence which alarmed him, he fled out of Italy, returned to Paris, and was again "reconciled." Here he revealed his pretended design of killing the queen to Morgan, by whom, if we may believe him, it was approved;[1] but, again affecting to feel a scruple of conscience as to the lawfulness of the deed, he was advised to consult Persons and Allen. The first of these he refused to see; and when he was introduced to the latter, he had not the courage to put the question. He made the experiment, however, on Waytes, and some other English priests, who all condemned

1584. Jan. 1.

the design; and, being foiled in this attempt, procured from Morgan an introduction to the nuncio Raggazzoni, to whom he gave a letter for Cardinal Como, the Roman secretary of state, and from whom he received a promise that the answer should be forwarded to him in England. Parry now returned; made to Elizabeth, in the presence of Burghley and Walsingham, a pompous though obscure narrative of his services; maintained that he had been solicited by the pope to murder the queen; and in a few weeks gave to her the answer of the cardinal Como, in testimony of his veracity. This, however, proved to be no more than a civil answer to a general offer of service: neither his letter nor that of the cardinal contained the remotest

[1] Mary Stuart declared that she did not believe Parry's accusation of Morgan. She thought him incapable of such a crime.—Jebb, ii. 675. Parry, in his letter to the queen, observes, "that it "will not be in his power to fasten this charge upon Morgan; the "proof depending upon his yea and my nay, and having no letter "or cipher of his to charge him."—Strype, iii. App. 103. The ministers printed Parry's letter, but were careful to omit this passage: it was first published by Strype from the original.

allusion to the murder;[1] and, to his surprise, when he demanded a pension from the queen, he was told that he had done nothing to deserve a reward. His wants increased; he petitioned for the mastership of St. Catherine's Hospital, and harassed the council with requests, till necessity compelled him to return to his former habits, and to set on foot a new intrigue.[2] It was necessary to give this account of Parry, that, from a previous acquaintance with his character, the reader might be better able to judge of the mysterious affair which followed.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1584. — 1585. Sept. 3.

Among the exiles in the pay of the English government was Edmond Neville, of the family of the earls of Westmoreland, who, as long as Persons resided at Rouen, had been employed to watch the motions of

[1] The letter of the cardinal furnished a pretence for the most violent declamation against the pope, as if he had been acquainted with the design to kill the queen, and had granted a pardon for it beforehand. The fact, however, is, that Parry in his letter never alluded to the design. He merely said that he was returning to England, and hoped to atone for his past misdeeds by his subsequent services to the Catholic church.—Bartoli, 288. Discovery of Squyer's fiction, p. 4. The answer of the cardinal may be seen in Sadler, ii. 500. In it the pope exhorts him to persevere in his good intentions, and grants the indulgence which he had asked for, that which was usually granted to persons on their reconciliation.

[2] This account of Parry is taken from his letters in Strype, ii. 593, 648; iii. 79, 82, 188, 252, 259, Holinshed, 1388. His confession, ibid. and State Trials, i. 1095; Bartoli, 286—289; and Camden, 427—430. It is a singular fact that Burghley placed so much confidence in Parry, that when his wife's nephew, Anthony Bacon, began his travels, the lord treasurer wrote to the young man, and advised him to contract and cultivate an intimate acquaintance with Parry, who was then at Paris. Leicester immediately informed the queen that Bacon was the friend of an exile and traitor; but Burghley convinced her that neither the religion nor the loyalty of his nephew would be shaken in the company of Parry. —Birch, from the original letters, vol. i. pp. 12, 13. As late as October 24, 1583, we have a letter from Parry to Burghley, giving him a good character of young Wm. Cecil and his tutor.—Lansdowne MSS. Nos. 39—43.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1585.

that enterprising Jesuit. Neville had lately obtained permission to come to England. He claimed the inheritance of the last Lord Latymer; but met with a powerful antagonist in the eldest son of Lord Burghley, who was in actual possession of the estate. To this man Parry attached himself, and, while he described him to the queen as a dangerous and suspicious character, sought to drive him to despair, by persuading him that Burghley was his mortal enemy. They soon grew intimate; they swore to be secret and true to each other; they talked of different projects, some for the delivery of the queen of Scots, others for the assassination of Elizabeth. It appears to have been a trial of skill between two experienced impostors, which should be able to entangle the other in the toils. Neville succeeded. He denounced Parry; they were confronted; and the Welshman, after a

Feb. 1. faint denial, acknowledged that he had solicited Neville to assassinate the queen.

Feb. 14. In the Tower he made a long confession, and wrote

Feb. 18. several letters to Elizabeth and her ministers. To an ordinary reader they bear the marks of a distempered mind; though perhaps those to whom they were addressed might, from their knowledge of his previous conduct, explain the contradictions with which they seem to abound. The sum of his confession was, that Morgan had urged him to murder the queen; that Cardinal Como, in the name of the pontiff, had approved the project; that the sight of Elizabeth, and the consideration of her virtues, had induced him to repent; but that the perusal of a work by Dr. Allen had revived his traitorous resolution, and led him to propose the design to Neville. At his trial, buoyed

Feb. 25. up with the hope of pardon, he pleaded guilty; his

confession was read, and the chief justice prepared to pass sentence. At that moment, overcome with terror, he exclaimed that he was innocent; that his confession was a tissue of falsehoods, extorted from him by threats and promises; that he had never harboured a thought, and that Como had never given any approbation, of the murder. His petition to withdraw his plea being refused, judgment was pronounced; and the unhappy man exclaimed that, if he perished, his blood would lie heavy on the head of his sovereign. CHAP. V. A.D. 1585

On the scaffold, which was erected in the palace yard, he renewed the protestation of his innocence. Topcliffe, the noted pursuivant, objected the letter of the cardinal. "Oh sir," replied Parry, "you clean "mistake it. I deny any such matter to be in the "letter, and I wish it might be truly examined and "considered of." Being told to hasten, he repeated the Lord's prayer in Latin, with some other devotions: the cart was drawn away; and the executioner, catching him at the first swing, instantly cut the rope, and butchered him alive.[1] March 2.

It is a matter of doubt whether Parry were guilty or not. The queen at first thought that he had mentioned the project to Neville for the sole purpose of sounding Neville's disposition;[2] she was afterwards

[1] See the authentic account given to Burghley in Strype, iii. 251. It adds: "When his heart was taken out, he gave a great groan." It has been supposed that Allen's book, to which he alluded in his confession, "justified and recommended the murder of heretical "princes." This is a mistake. Allen wrote no such work. Parry referred to Allen's answer to Burghley.

[2] I am inclined to think that Parry acted in this instance with her permission. 1. He had told her that Neville was "a dangerous "and suspicious character." 2. On Parry's apprehension, she insisted that the first question put to him should be this:—Have you not proposed the murder of the queen to "a dangerous and sus-

CHAP. V. A.D. 1585.

induced to believe that he was a dissembler, who sold his services to both parties, and who would, had he not been prevented, have imbrued his hands in her blood. However that may be, no man can deny that, for his former crimes, his complex and suspicious intrigues, and his base attempts to inveigle others into conspiracies that he might have the merit of betraying them, he amply deserved to die, though he might be innocent of the offence for which he suffered.

The conviction of Parry, and still more the supposed approbation of his crime by the pontiff, were thought to justify the severity of the penal laws now in progress through the two houses. The Catholics, before their doom was sealed by the royal assent, sought to propitiate the queen by a long and eloquent petition. In it they vindicated their loyalty and their religion from the odious doctrines with which they had been charged. They declared, 1. That all Catholics, both laity and clergy, held her to be their sovereign, as well de jure as de facto: 2. That they believed it to be sinful for any person whomsoever to lift up his hand against her, as God's anointed: 3. That it was not in the power of priest or pope to give license to any man to do, or attempt to do, that which was

"picious character in order to try him?"—Camden, 427. 3. He hinted as much on the scaffold: "This is my last farewell to you all. "I die a true servant to Queen Elizabeth. For any evil thought "that I had to harm her, it never came into my mind. *She knoweth "it;* and *her own conscience can tell her so.* I concealed it [his "intrigue with Neville] upon confidence of her majesty, to whom I "had before bewrayed what I had been solicited to do." 4. He ends his letter to the queen thus: "Remember your unfortunate "Parry, *chiefly overthrown by your hand.*" This, however, was suppressed by the ministers in the printed copies.—Strype, iii. App. 103.

sinful: and 4. That, if such an opinion were held by any one, they renounced him and his opinion as devilish and abominable, heretical and contrary to the Catholic faith. Wherefore they prayed that she would not consider them as disloyal subjects, merely because they abstained, through motives of conscience, from the established service; but would have a merciful consideration of their sufferings, and would refuse her assent to the law which had for its object to banish all Catholic priests out of the realm. This petition was communicated to the chief of the Catholic clergy and gentry, and was universally approved. When it was asked who would venture to present it to the queen, Richard Shelley, of Michael Grove, in Sussex, took upon himself the risk, and was made to pay the penalty. The council, for his presumption, committed him to prison; where, after a confinement for several years, he died, the victim of his zeal to alleviate the sufferings of his brethren, and an evidence of the cruel and unprincipled policy pursued by the government.[1]

The queen of Scots had passed the winter in the most cruel disquietude. From the moment that she saw the bond of association, it had been her conviction that she was condemned to death in the secret council of her adversaries. The ratification of that bond by act of parliament; the suspicions thrown out

[1] Compare Strype, iii. 298, who supposes that the petition was presented to parliament, with Pattenson, pp. 496, 497. When Shelley was brought before the council, he was required to reveal the names of those who concurred with him in the petition. Aware of the object, he gave the names of such only as were known recusants. It was then objected that the petitioners ought to have refuted the arguments of Dr. Allen in favour of the deposing power; and he was required to sign a paper, declaring that all who held the deposing power were traitors. This he refused.—Ibid.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1585. of her being an accomplice in the supposed treasons of Throckmorton and Parry; her removal from Sheffield to the old and ruinous castle of Tutbury; the intention of transferring the care of her person from the earl of Shrewsbury, whose honour had been her protection, to a keeper of inferior rank, Sir Amyas Paulet, the dependant of Leicester, contributed to agitate her mind with continual alarms. She was not, however, wanting to herself. By repeated letters, she sought to awaken the pity or affection of Elizabeth; Jan. 5. she signed a bond of her own composition, by which she declared all persons who should attempt the life or dignity of her good sister, enemies whom she would pursue unto the death;[1] she protested that she was completely ignorant of the designs attributed to Throckmorton and Parry; and she defied her enemies to produce any proof which could in the slightest degree affect her innocence.[2]

The discovery of Gray's treachery had induced Mary to complain to her son of the conduct of his favourite. James returned a cold and disrespectful answer; reminding her, in the conclusion, that she had no right to interfere with his concerns; that she was only the queen-mother, and as such, though she enjoyed the royal title, possessed no authority within the realm of Scotland.[3] This letter opened the eyes of the captive to the hopelessness of her situation. Even the son, on

[1] Murdin, 548.

[2] Jebb, ii. 569, 674. Mary had left Sheffield Castle for Wingfield on September 3, 1584, under the temporary custody of Sir Ralph Sadler and Sir John Somers; where she remained till January 13 of the next year, when she was conveyed back to Tutbury. On the resignation of Lord Shrewsbury, Lord St. John had been appointed her keeper; but he contrived to escape the unpleasant task, and on April 20, Sir Amyas Paulet relieved Sadler, with Sir Drue Drury for his assistant.

[3] Jebb, 573.

whose affection she rested her fondest hopes, had deceived, had abandoned her. In the anguish of her mind, she formed the resolution of disowning him, if he persisted in his disobedience; of depriving him of every right which he might claim through her; and of transferring all her pretensions to a prince who might be both willing and able to assert them.[1] But, while she revolved these thoughts in her mind, an accident happened to awaken new alarms. A young man, a Catholic recusant, and suspected to be a priest, had been brought a prisoner to Tutbury. He was confined in a room adjoining to her chamber, was carried several times by force, and before her eyes, to the service in the chapel, and, at the end of three weeks, being found dead in his dungeon, was hanged before her window during the night.[2] His fate she considered a prelude to her own; and, under this impression, she wrote to Elizabeth, begging, as a last favour, her liberty and life. She demanded nothing more; as to the conditions, her good sister might name, and she would subscribe them. She had now nothing to preserve for a son who had abandoned her; and was therefore ready to make every sacrifice, except that of her religion. But the English queen, no longer afraid of the interposition of James, neglected the offers and prayers of her captive, and committed the custody of her person to Sir Amyas Paulet, the keeper, from

CHAP. V. A.D. 1585. March 24. April 8. April 17.

[1] Jebb, 573.

[2] See her letters in Jebb, ii. 580, 582; Lettres de Marie, vi. 152, 159; and Egerton's Life of Lord Egerton, Paris, 1812, p. 4. "En ceste sinistre oppinion, ne m'ha pas peu confirmé l'accident "de ce presbystre qui, après avoit esté tant tourmenté, fut trouvé "pendu sur la muraille viz à viz devant mes fenestres." The French minister made repeated inquiries, but could get no other answer from the council than that the prisoner through fright had hanged himself with his garters.—Egerton, p. 205.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1585.

whose austerity and fanaticism Mary anticipated nothing but severity, perhaps assassination.[1]

These terrors were not, however, confined to the queen of Scots; they were common to the whole body of the English Catholics, whose lives and fortunes had been placed, by the late enactments, at the mercy of their adversaries, and who believed that one great object of the association was a general massacre of the most distinguished professors of the ancient creed. Some, to save themselves, entered into the household of the earl of Leicester, or of the other favourites of the queen; many, abandoning their families and possessions, retired beyond the seas, and risked their lives in the service of foreign powers. Of the others there were two, the earls of Arundel and Northumberland, whose rank and misfortunes claim more particularly the attention of the reader. 1. Philip Howard was
1575. the eldest son of the last duke of Norfolk, by Mary Fitzallan, daughter to the earl of Arundel. At the age of eighteen he was introduced to Elizabeth, who received him graciously, and lavished on him marks of the royal favour. He soon mixed in all the gaieties, and indulged in all the vices of a licentious court. His wife[2] was forsaken, was even renounced, for some

[1] Paulet was no assassin in cold blood, but he was determined to put Mary to death, before she should be taken from him by force. "If I should be violently attacked, I will be assured by the grace "of God, that she shall die before me."—Paulet to Burghley, June 12, 1585. See note (Q).

[2] She was Anne, daughter to Thomas Lord Dacre of the north. They were publicly married as soon as she had completed her twelfth year, and again privately as soon as he had completed his fourteenth. There was probably something in these proceedings on which he founded the pretended nullity of the marriage. To what female at court he attached himself, we know not; but we are told by his biographer that the queen was surrounded by women of the most dissolute character; and that, for a married man to aspire to

other distinguished female; and the earl, his maternal grandfather, and the lady Lumley, his aunt, to mark their disapprobation of his conduct, bequeathed to others a considerable part of their property. On the death of the former, he claimed, with the possession of the castle, the title of earl of Arundel; and his right, though he was not yet restored in blood,[1] was admitted by the council. But afterwards, whether it arose, as he himself conceived, from the misrepresentations of the men who feared his resentment for the death of his father, or from the officious imprudence of the friends of Mary Stuart, who held him out as the hereditary head of their party, he rapidly declined in the favour of his sovereign; and it was soon evident that he had become to the royal mind an object of distrust, if not of aversion. In these circumstances, Arundel retired from court to the society of his wife, to whom he endeavoured to atone for his past neglect by his subsequent attachment. But Elizabeth's displeasure pursued him into his retreat. The countess was the first to feel it. She was presented for recusancy, and confined, under a royal warrant, for twelve months in the house of Sir Thomas Shirley. No similar annoyance could reach the earl himself, for he was still a Protestant; but repeated attempts to connect him with real or pretended conspiracies, particularly with that attributed to Throckmorton, warned him of the impending danger; and he had already

CHAP. V. A.D. 1575—1579. Feb. 24.

the royal favour, it was previously requisite that he should be on evil terms with his wife.—See the MS. Life of Philippe Howard, c. iii. in possession of his grace the duke of Norfolk.

[1] He took his seat in the house of Lords, April 11, 1580; and the bill restoring him in blood received the royal assent March 18, 1581.—Lords' Journals, ii. 13, 54.

CHAP. V. A.D. 1579. come to the determination of seeking an asylum in a foreign land, when he was stopped by a visit from the queen, who, after dinner, at her departure, bade him look upon himself as a prisoner in his own house.[1]

1585. These several affronts sank deep into the breast of Arundel. From the time of Campian's disputation in the Tower, he had been in his own mind a convert to the Catholic creed, though his unwillingness to forfeit the royal favour induced him still to conform to the established worship. But now, smarting under oppression, and viewing these wrongs as the judgment of God in punishment of his pusillanimity, he sent privately for a priest, and was "reconciled" to the Catholic church, an act which, as he well knew, had been made high treason by a late statute. But his resolution was taken. He left London to make preparations for his flight beyond the sea, and wrote from Arundel to the queen a long and eloquent epistle, in April 15. which he enumerated the failure of all his attempts to gain her confidence, the ascendancy of his enemies in her council, the disgrace which he had suffered, the fate of his father and grandfather, who, though innocent, had perished as traitors, and the penalties to which he was exposed on the ground of his religion. He was come, he said, to the point "in which he must "consent either to the certain destruction of his body, "or the manifest endangering of his soul;" and he therefore trusted that, if, to escape such evils, he should leave the realm without license, she would not

[1] About Christmas 1584 the earl gave a sumptuous banquet to the queen, who, on that occasion, speaking of him to Castelnau, "loua fort ledit Comte d'Arondel et son bon naturel."—Castel. to the king, in Egerton, 204.

visit him with her displeasure, which he should esteem the bitterest of all his losses, the most severe of all his misfortunes.[1] Having intrusted this letter to a messenger, he embarked, little aware that he had been all the while beset with spies and informers, and that his own servants, and the very master of the ship which was to convey him, were in the pay of the ministers. He had hardly lost sight of the coast of Sussex, when two sail were descried in full chase. They were under the command of Kelloway, a pretended pirate. After a short resistance, in which he received a slight wound, Arundel surrendered. He was delivered by Kelloway to Sir George Carey, the son of Lord Hunsdon, and committed by the council to the Tower. His imprisonment was followed by that of his brother, the lord William Howard, and of his sister, the lady Margaret Sackville.[2]

April 24.

On his examination before the commissioners, the innocence of the earl disconcerted the malice of his adversaries.[3] He remained more than twelve months

[1] This letter is in Stowe, 702—706. In one part he insinuates that the persons who enjoy her confidence are atheists at heart. This was often said of Raleigh; but he did not belong to the council. Probably the earl may allude to Leicester and Walsingham. As early as the 16th of April, Castelnau had learned that the queen meant to "lay her hand on Arundel's collar."—Egert. 202.

[2] MS. Life. Egerton, 204, 205. Stowe, 706.

[3] A letter was produced, purporting to have been written by him to Dix, his steward in Norfolk, in which he was made to say that he should shortly return at the head of a powerful army. He was only allowed to read the two first lines, which were written in a hand not unlike his own. He pronounced it a forgery; and though it was first shown by Walsingham, there was so much mystery about the manner in which it came into the hands of the secretary, that the majority of the council ordered it to be withdrawn.—Life of Philippe Howard, c. ix. He maintained that his only object in going abroad was that he might live "en liberté de conscience, qui

CHAP. V. A.D. 1586. — May 17.

unnoticed in prison; at length the charge of treason was converted into that of contempt, and he was accused in the star-chamber of having sought to leave the kingdom without license, and of having corresponded with Allen, who had been declared the queen's enemy. He replied that in the first he was justified by necessity, because the laws of the country did not permit him to worship God according to his conscience; and that his correspondence with Allen was not on matters of state, but of religion. Both pleas were overruled; and he was condemned to pay a fine of ten thousand pounds, and to suffer imprisonment during the pleasure of the queen. She made him feel the weight of her resentment. His confinement was rigorous beyond example; it lasted for life; and his fate was afterwards aggravated by a new trial and condemnation on a charge of high treason.[1]

The apprehension of the earl of Arundel was followed by the tragic death of Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland. From the moment that nobleman discovered his attachment to the ancient faith, he had been surrounded with spies; and during the last ten years had been forbidden to depart from the vicinity of the metropolis. The arrest of Throckmorton had caused that of William Shelley, an acquaintance of the earl; and from the confession, voluntary or ex-

"luy importoit plus que quarante mille escus de rente, et belles "maysons, et authorité du premier seigneur d'Angleterre."—Egerton, 246.

[1] He was closely confined during thirteen months, before he could obtain permission that any of his servants might wait on him. —Ibid. c. x. xi. His countess, after his imprisonment, bore him a son. But she was refused permission to visit him, and was otherwise treated with great cruelty.—Her MS. Life, c. vi.

torted, of that gentleman, it was inferred that Percy had given his assent to the supposed conspiracy for which Throckmorton suffered.[1] He was sent to the Tower; but though he remained more than a year in close confinement, no preparation was made for his trial. On the 20th of June the lieutenant received an order to remove the earl's keeper, and to substitute in his place one Bailiff, a servant of the vice-chamberlain, Sir Christopher Hatton; and the same night the prisoner was found dead in his bed, having been shot through the heart with three slugs. A coroner's inquest returned a verdict of felo de se; and three days later the chancellor, the vice-chamberlain, the lord chief baron, the attorney and solicitor-general, severally harangued the audience in the star-chamber, to prove that the earl had been guilty of treason, and that, conscious of his guilt, he had, to spare himself the ignominy of a public execution, and to preserve the honours and property of his family, committed self-murder.[2] Yet the change of his

CHAP. V. A.D. 1586.

1585. June 20.

[1] He was the brother of Thomas the attainted earl. During the rebellion he had levied forces for Elizabeth against his brother; afterwards he offered to assist in a project for the liberation of the queen of Scots. But his services were refused, under the idea that he acted in collusion with Burghley.—Murdin, 21, 119. Anderson, iii. 221. The ministers, on the one hand, appeared to believe him in earnest (Lodge, ii. 69), condemning him in the star-chamber in a fine of five thousand marks; and on the other to know that he was not, never exacting the fine, but granting him the earldom, which he claimed.—State Trials, i. 1115, 1127.

[2] The earl had certainly allowed Charles Paget, one of the exiles, to meet Lord Paget at his house at Petworth, for the purpose, as they pretended, of making a settlement of the family estates. The chief evidence against him was Shelley, who pretended to have heard from Paget that the earl had entered into a conspiracy with him for the invasion of the kingdom. Shelley may have said so; but the fact is denied by Paget in an intercepted letter to the queen of Scots: "That W. Shelley, as they say, should confess that I have

CHAP. V. A.D 1585.

keeper, the great difficulty of conveying fire-arms to a prisoner in the Tower, and even the solicitude of the court to convict him of suicide, served to confirm, in the minds of many, a suspicion that his enemies, unable to bring home the charge of treason, had removed him by assassination.[1]

"revealed some practices I had with the earl to him, herein, as I "shall answer at the day of judgment, they say most untruly; for "that I never had talk with the said Shelley in all my life, but "such ordinary talk as the council might have heard, being indif- "ferent."—Murdin, 403.

[1] See the coroner's inquest in Stowe, 706; the government account in Somers's Tracts, iii. 420; Howell's State Trials, 1111; Camden, 434; Bridgewater, 204. To prove the suicide, one Mullan was brought forward, who said that he had sold the dag or gun; and another prisoner, Pantin, who asserted that he saw it delivered into the hands of the earl by a servant called Price. But Price himself, though in custody, was not produced.—State Trials, i. 1124, 1125. On the other hand I observe that, in a letter from Sir Walter Raleigh to Sir Robert Cecil, in Murdin, it is assumed, as a fact known to them both, that the earl was murdered by the contrivance of Hatton. —Murdin, 811.

The foregoing statement has been severely condemned as unjust to the memory of Hatton by Sir Harris Nicolas, in his very valuable Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton, p. 428 —441. I may, however, be allowed to say that still, in my opinion, the bare facts already mentioned supply strong ground for suspicion that Northumberland was murdered in his cell by his new warder, Bailiff; and if that were so, it will be no easy matter to clear Bailiff's master, Hatton, from participation in the crime.

That Hatton was a partaker in it, appears to have been assumed as a well-known fact by Raleigh, in his letter to Sir Robert Cecil already mentioned. In 1601 the earl of Essex had been convicted of treason, and received judgment of death; many applications were made to the queen to grant him a pardon; and Raleigh wrote to Sir Robert Cecil, her prime minister, not to relent towards the tyrant (Essex) through any apprehension of injurious consequences to himself from the enmity of the relatives and adherents of that nobleman. "For after-revenges," he wrote, "fear them not; for "your own father, that was esteemed to be the contriver of Nor- "folk's ruin, yet his son followeth your father's son, and loveth him. "Humours of men succeed not, but grow by occasions of time and "power. Somerset made no revenge on the duke of Northumber- "land's heirs. Northumberland that now is, thinks not of Hatton's "issue. Kelloway lives that murdered the brother of Horsey, and

"Horsey let him go by all his lifetime."—Murdin, 811. In this passage Raleigh places Hatton, with respect to the death of Northumberland, in the same catagory with three other persons who had deprived their victims of life, either on the scaffold, or by assassination, and yet had never met with retribution from the friends or kindred of the sufferers. It appears to me that his reasoning with Cecil is based on the admission by them both, that the violent death of Northumberland was owing to the contrivance of Hatton, as the death of the duke of Norfolk and of the other victims mentioned by him had been owing to the contrivance of Lord Burghley and their respective persecutors; and, moreover, that Hatton's conduct on that occasion had been of such a description as to call loudly for vengeance from the house of Percy. "Northumberland that now is "thinks not of Hatton's issue."

It is true that the coroner's jury returned a verdict of felo de se; but that verdict appears to me of very little value. It was founded on the testimony of Hopton, the lieutenant of the Tower, that, when he came to Northumberland's cell, he found the door bolted on the inside, and commanded the warders to break it open. Hence the jury, supposing that no one could have entered the apartment, found that the earl had been guilty of his own death; but it should be remembered, that when Hopton reached the door, a considerable time had elapsed since the explosion of the dag, and more than three hours since the earl had retired to rest. Was it certain that the door had been bolted, as he found it, during the whole of that time? To this important question Hopton could not speak; but there was one man, and one man only, who could make answer to it. Yet this man, Bailiff, the new warder, who had called upon the lieutenant, the moment that he saw him, to demolish the door, was not examined. Again, it might be asked if there was no secret contrivance by which the bolt within could be moved by a person from without. Perhaps Price, the old warder, as well as Bailiff, could have answered this question; but neither Price nor Bailiff was called. It is said, indeed, that they may have been called, though their names are not mentioned; but I will not believe that, if they had been examined, and had given favourable evidence, such evidence would have been expunged from the official copy of the proceedings.

With respect to the several speeches made for show in the star-chamber, they reveal the deep anxiety of the cabinet to remove from themselves the imputation of having been parties to the foul deed; but it may fairly be doubted whether such proceedings were calculated to produce that effect. It was necessary to assign some reason why Northumberland should take his own life. That was an easy task; but such reasons, after all, were bare conjectures, and not facts. The long and laboured harangues of the attorney and solicitor-general presented a variety of statements frequently very questionable, and generally irrelevant; and the declamation of Hatton was at best only a virulent philippic against the defunct

CHAP. V. A.D. 1585.

nobleman, representing him as a man of the most treasonable disposition, without character, without gratitude, and without conscience. Surely, with a righteous cause they might have adopted a line of proceeding less likely to provoke suspicion in the minds of cautious but sincere inquirers. Camden alludes to the report, but does not adopt it, because it was not sufficiently authenticated —parum compertum—and he had made it a rule to assert nothing upon hearsay.—Camden, 435.

CHAPTER VI.

ELIZABETH CONSENTS TO PROTECT THE BELGIAN INSURGENTS—CONCLUDES A TREATY WITH JAMES OF SCOTLAND—INTRIGUES OF MORGAN AND PAGET—BABINGTON'S PLOT—DETECTION AND EXECUTION OF THE CONSPIRATORS—PROCEEDINGS AGAINST MARY—HER TRIAL AT FOTHERINGHAY—JUDGMENT AGAINST HER—PETITION OF PARLIAMENT—INTERCESSION OF THE KINGS OF FRANCE AND SCOTLAND—HER EXECUTION—THE DISSIMULATION OF ELIZABETH—WHO PUNISHES HER COUNSELLORS—AND APPEASES THE FRENCH AND SCOTTISH KINGS.

By the death of the duke of Anjou, the right of succession to the crown of France had devolved on Henri de Bourbon, king of Navarre. Thus by a singular coincidence it happened that, in France as well as in England, the presumptive heir was a person professing a religion different from that established by law; nor were the Catholics in the one country more willing to see a Protestant, than the Protestants in the other to see a Catholic sovereign on the throne. There was, however, this difference; in England the right was claimed by a female and a captive, whose life lay at the mercy of her enemies; but in France the heir was a sovereign prince, in possession of liberty, and at the head of a numerous and powerful party. Mary Stuart might at any hour be removed out of the way; to prevent Henry from ascending the throne, battles were to be fought, and a war of extermination was to be waged. Their fortunes corresponded with

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1585. their circumstances. She perished on a scaffold; he, after a long and obstinate struggle, secured the crown on his head by conforming to the religion professed by the majority of his subjects.

The man who organized this opposition to the right of Henry was the young duke of Guise, a prince who had inherited the talents with the ambition of his family, and whose zeal for religion was animated by the desire of avenging the murder of his father. While Anjou lay on his death-bed, the duke consulted his friends, and resolved to call into action the dormant energies of the league; and the former was no sooner dead, than the emissaries of the latter spread themselves throughout the kingdom, exhorting the people to reform the abuses of the government, to provide for the permanence of their religion, and to learn a useful lesson from the example of a neighbouring realm, where even a woman, in possession of the sovereign authority, had been able to abolish the national worship, and to exclude the Catholic nobility
March 31. from their legitimate influence in the state. Assemblies were held; treaties were signed; and the cardinal of Bourbon, the uncle of Henry, was declared first prince of the blood, and presumptive heir to the throne.[1] The king of France, though he deemed the league an act of treason against his authority, found it prudent to place himself at its head, but the leaguers, suspicious of his intentions, compelled him to pursue measures the most hostile to his feelings. The wars and pacifications, the perjuries, murders, and crimes which ensued, are foreign to the subject of this history; but it is necessary to

[1] See his declaration in the Mémoires de Nevers, i. 641—647.

observe that Elizabeth kept her eyes fixed on the struggle between the two parties; that she believed her own interests to be intimately connected with those of the king of Navarre; and that much of her conduct for some years was suggested by a wish to avoid the dangers which she anticipated from the final success of the duke of Guise. To Henry she sent large sums of money, and repeatedly made the offer of an asylum in England, whenever he might find himself an unequal match for his enemies. Under her protection he would live in security; and might at some subsequent period make a more fortunate attempt in support of his claim.[1]

Among the princes who had subscribed their names to the league, the most powerful was the king of Spain. But though he promised much, he performed little. His great object was the reduction of the Netherlands. The French expedition under Anjou had formerly disconcerted his plans; he now persuaded himself, that if he could keep alive the flame of civil war in France, nothing could interrupt the victorious career of his general Farnese, the celebrated prince of Parma.[2] To his surprise a new and most formidable obstacle was opposed from a quarter whence it was not expected. The States, despairing of aid from France, threw themselves on the pity of England; and the deputies of the revolted provinces, falling on their knees, besought Elizabeth to number the Belgian people among her subjects. Their petition was supported by the leading June 29.

[1] Strype, iii. 395.

[2] See, in the Mémoires de Nevers, the letters from Rome of the duke of Nevers to the cardinal of Bourbon, and to the duke and the cardinal of Guise.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1585. members of the council, Leicester, Burghley, and Walsingham, who maintained that their sovereign owed it to her religion to succour the professors of the reformed faith; and to her people, to disable Philip from invading England, by taking possession of his maritime provinces. But the queen was a firm believer in the divine right of kings; she could not persuade herself that the Spanish monarch had forfeited the sovereignty of the States; nor that subjects had, under any pretext, the right of transferring their allegiance. To accept the offer, she contended, would disgrace her in the eyes of the other sovereigns, and would form a precedent dangerous to herself. To silence these scruples, Leicester had recourse to the authority of the bishops. If the metropolitan declined the task, on the plea that the Catholic princes must have as much right to send forces to the aid of the English Catholics as Elizabeth could have to support foreign Protestants, the earl found a more zealous, or more courtly casuist in the bishop of Oxford, who pronounced the measure not only lawful in itself, but one which the queen could not in conscience reject.[1] While, however, *she* consulted, the prince of Parma improved his former advantages; after an obstinate defence Antwerp capitulated; and Elizabeth, subdued by the importunities of her favourite, the arguments of her counsellors, and the solicitations of the
September deputies, consented to sign a treaty with the States, not as their sovereign, but as their ally; not to with-

[1] The bishop argued that the queen, according to the Scriptures, was a nursing mother of the church. Now the church was not confined to England, but embraced all the professors of the gospel; it was therefore her duty to protect them, even in foreign countries, from the tyranny of idolaters.—See Strype's Life of Whitgift, 229, 231; and Records 97

draw them from their dependence on the Spanish crown, but to recover for them those franchises which they formerly enjoyed. It was stipulated that she should furnish, at her own cost, an auxiliary army of six thousand men; that her expenses should be repaid within five years after the restoration of peace; and that she should retain, as securities, the towns of Brille and Flushing, and the strong fort of Rammekins.[1] CHAP. VI. A.D. 1585.

In these circumstances it became of the first importance to secure the amity of Scotland. On the fickle and temporizing character of the king little reliance could be placed; he was ready to intrigue with every party, and to profess attachment to every prince who would relieve his necessities with money. But experience had shown that Scotland might be ruled by a faction in defiance of the sovereign; and most of the royal counsellors had already been bought with the presents and promises of Elizabeth. Even Arran made the tender of his services; but his sincerity was doubted; and Wotton was despatched as ambassador to watch his conduct, and undermine his influence. The intrigues of Wotton were aided by an accidental rencontre on the borders, in which Lord Russell, the son of the earl of Bedford, perished. There was nothing to distinguish this from other similar affrays; but the English council pretended that it was the result of a plot to provoke hostilities between the nations; and required the surrender of its supposed authors, Kerr of Fernihurst, and Arran the protector of Kerr. To elude the demand, James placed both under arrest; and Wotton improved the May

[1] Rymer, xv. 93—98. Camden, 444, 446.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1585. opportunity of Arran's absence from court to weave a new and more important intrigue. He suggested to the Scottish partisans of Elizabeth a plan to seize the person of the king, and to transport him into England or confine him in the castle of Stirling. His secret was betrayed; and the ambassador, by a precipitate flight, escaped the vengeance of the monarch. The Oct. 16. moment he was gone, Arran resumed his seat in the council; but his activity was checked by the secret friends of Wotton; the exiles, with a supply of English gold, returned across the borders; their numbers swelled as they approached Stirling; they were treacherously admitted into the town; and the king, unable to resist, opened the gates of the castle. He Nov. 3. was now at the mercy of the lords, the partisans of England, who regained their estates and honours, and received the government of the several forts as places of security.[1] A negotiation was opened with Elizabeth; and James, having obtained a promise that nothing should be done to the prejudice of his right 1586. July 5. to the succession, consented to a treaty, by which the queen of England and the king of Scotland bound themselves to support the reformed faith against the efforts of the Catholic powers, and to furnish to each other a competent aid in case of invasion by any foreign prince. During the negotiation, the name of the queen of Scots seems not to have been so much as mentioned.[2]

1585. With this treaty the queen had sufficient reason to be satisfied; but that which she had concluded with the states of Belgium proved to her a source of uneasiness and regret. The disgrace of aiding rebels,

[1] Camden, 436—440. Melville, 167. Spotis. 343.
[2] Camden, 466—473. Rymer, xv. 803.

who pretended to depose their lawful sovereign, haunted her mind;[1] she was careful to inculcate that she entered into the war not as a principal, but as a friend and ally, with no other view than to preserve entire the rights both of the prince and of the people; and she strictly forbade the earl of Leicester, the commander of her forces, to engage in any enterprise, or to accept of any honour, which could be construed into an admission that Philip had lost the sovereignty of the provinces. But the views of the favourite were very different from those of his mistress. His ambition aspired to the place which had been possessed and forfeited by the duke of Anjou; and, on his arrival in Holland, he asked, and after some demur obtained, from the gratitude of the States, the title of excellency, the office of captain-general of the United Provinces, and the whole control of the army, the finances, and the courts of judicature. When the news reached England, the queen manifested her vexation by the violence of her language. She charged Leicester with presumption and vanity, with contempt of the royal authority, with having sacrificed the honour of his sovereign to his own ambition; but when she was afterwards told that he had sent for his countess, whom she hated, and was preparing to hold a court, which in splendour should eclipse her own, she burst into a paroxysm of rage, swearing "with great oaths, that she would have no "more courts under her obeysance than one," and that she would let the upstart know how easily the

A.D. 1585. Oct. 8. Dec. 8. 1586. January.

[1] "Her majesty, I see, my lord, often tymes doth fall in mys-"like of this cause, and sundrie opinions it may breede in her ma-"jesty withall, but I trust," &c.—Leicester to Burghley, in Wright, ii. 273.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

hand which had raised him could also beat him to the ground.[1]

If Elizabeth's anger alarmed, Leicester's silence and apathy perplexed, the lords of the council. It was in vain that they offered apologies for his conduct, and forged despatches from him to appease her displeasure.[2] She was, or pretended to be, inexorable. Each day she announced his immediate recall; his friends were loaded by her with injuries; her letters to him were filled with expressions of reproach, and menace, and contempt. The earl bore these effusions of the royal anger with the most provoking indifference. Convinced of his influence over her heart, he left to his colleagues in England the task of vindicating his conduct, and continued to act as if he were beyond the reach of her authority. His time was spent in progressing from one city to another; everywhere he gave and received the most sumptuous entertainments; and on all occasions displayed the magnificence of a sovereign prince.[3] In these altercations three months were suffered to roll away. Elizabeth always threatened, but had never the resolution to strike; and her resentment was, at last,

Feb. 10.

[1] Hardwicke Papers, 299.

[2] I think I may call it a forgery. Leicester had written to Hatton a letter which the ministers determined to suppress, as it was more calculated to irritate than to appease the queen. Afterwards, finding it necessary to gain time, "they conferred "of the letter again, and blotting out some things, which they "thought would be offensive, and mending some other parts as "they thought best," they presented it to her.—Hardwicke Papers, 300.

[3] There was one exception to this round of entertainments, a day of general fast. Neither Leicester himself, nor any one in his household, was allowed to eat or drink till after sunset. From the dawn till that hour they were employed in public prayer, listening to the discourses of the preachers, and chanting psalms. —See Stowe, 713, 714.

subdued by humble and deprecatory letters from Leicester himself, aided by the address of his colleague, the lord Burghley. That minister, under pretence that his services were become useless, tendered his resignation. She called him a presumptuous fellow; but the next morning her passion had subsided; she listened to the remonstrances of the council, and consented that a plentiful supply of men and money should be sent to the captain-general of the Netherlands.[1] March 30.

The arrival of the English army had revived the drooping spirits of the Belgians: its presence in the field, while it gave a lustre to their cause, could retard, but did not repel, the victorious advance of the Spaniards. The troops, indeed, fought with their accustomed valour: they gained some partial advantages; they wrested several towns from the possession of the enemy. But Leicester proved no match for Farnese; the accomplished courtier for the experienced and victorious general. At the close of the campaign, the balance of success was considerably in favour of the prince of Parma; and the earl, on his return to the Hague, was received with murmurs and remonstrances. Though he had conceived a sovereign contempt for the members of the States, as an assembly of merchants and shopkeepers, whose patriotism consisted in purchasing, at the lowest price, the services and blood of their allies, yet he found it difficult to return a satisfactory answer to their complaints,—that the result of the campaign had not been answerable to its expense, nor the number of the Eng- Oct. 22. Oct. 29.

[1] All these particulars may be found in the Hardwicke Papers, 297, 329; and in Camden, 459; and some in the letters to Leicester, in Wright, ii. 281—289.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

lish forces in the field equal to the number stipulated by treaty; that he had violated their privileges, ruined their finances, neglected military discipline, and extorted money by arbitrary and illegal expedients. In a moment of passion he dissolved the assembly; it continued to sit in defiance of his menaces; he next had recourse to concessions and promises; announced his intention of returning to England; and proposed to intrust the supreme authority, during his absence, to Sir William Pelham, or Sir William Stanley, or Sir Roland York. The States claimed it as their own right; he submitted, and resigned the government in a public sitting; though, at the same time, by a private instrument, he reserved it to himself. The cause of this hasty and informal proceeding was his anxiety to obey the command of Elizabeth that he should immediately return, and aid her with his advice in the important cause of the queen of Scots.[1]

The misfortunes of that princess were, at length, drawing to a close; her friends had blindly leagued themselves with her enemies to conduct her to the scaffold. The exiles whom religion or interest induced to espouse her cause, had soon become split into factions, which laid on each other the blame of their repeated failures and disappointments. Morgan and Paget, who, as the administrators of the queen's dower in France, found numerous adherents among the more needy of their companions, complained with bitterness that the introduction of the Jesuit missionaries had rendered the English government more suspicious and vigilant; that tracts had been written, which could

[1] Camden, 460, 463. Stowe, 729, 740. Bentivoglio, ii. 92, 99. Strada, l. viii. anno 1586.

only lead to irritation and severity; and that Persons and his brethren had monopolized the office of advocating the claims of Mary in foreign courts, to the exclusion of laymen, who were better adapted for such duties, and to the prejudice of the Scottish queen herself, whose secrets had been betrayed by the confession of Holt in the castle of Edinburgh, by that of Creighton in the Tower of London, and by the disclosures made by their partisan Gray, during the negotiation at Greenwich.[1] Their opponents replied, that the measures thus condemned had mainly contributed to the preservation of the Catholic worship in England; that Morgan and Paget were, at best, suspicious characters, since they were connected with men known to be the emissaries of Walsingham; that their impatience or perfidy had often caused them to adopt dangerous and unlawful projects; and that the real friends of Mary should have for their chief object the preservation of her life, and should therefore reject every plan, the discovery or failure of which might lead to her death. With these agreed her ambassador, the archbishop of Glasgow, and all her relations of the house of Guise; but Morgan and Paget possessed friends, to whom the habit of daily intercourse gave a greater influence over her counsels, Nau and Curle, her two secretaries, shut up with her in her prison.[2]

Against Morgan, the English queen was animated

[1] It seems to have been the treachery of Gray that led Mary to throw herself into the arms of this party. Gray had been sent with letters from Holt to Persons at Paris, and was admitted by him and his friends into all their secrets.—Murdin, 442. Mary writes to Castelnau: "Ce voyage de Gray n'a pas nuit seulement à son "credit, mais à celuy de ceux, qui se sont tant voulu mesler avec "luy."—Jebb, ii. 670.

[2] See the letters of Morgan and Paget, in Murdin, 442, 459, 465, 479, 496, 499, 507, 516. See also More, Hist. Provinciæ

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

with the most violent hatred. The charge brought against him by Parry, though unsupported by oral or written testimony, had provoked her to declare that she would give ten thousand pounds for his head; and, when she sent the order of the Garter to the French king, she demanded in return the person of Morgan. Henry dared not refuse, but was ashamed to consent. He adopted a middle course; he confined the Welshman in the Bastile, and sent his papers to the queen.[1] Morgan employed his time in meditating schemes of revenge; and for this purpose, with the aid of Paget, he procured the means of corresponding with Mary; and to effect his purpose, sought out agents and associates in every part of England. But he was opposed by one more artful than himself, by the secretary, Walsingham, who, aware of his malice, secretly encouraged his intrigues, and either threw in his way agents previously engaged by himself, or corrupted with bribes the fidelity of the agents whom he had previously engaged. The reader will observe, in the history of the conspiracy which is about to claim his attention, the co-existence of two plots, of one by Morgan against the life of Elizabeth, and of an underplot by Walsingham against the life of Mary. This, indeed, was hidden for a time from public view; but so much of it afterwards transpired, that it became with some a question whether the former were not devised as a cover for the latter; and whether the design against the queen of England was not originally suggested by the dark and insidious policy of the secretary, that he might thus make the rashness and

1585. March 9.

Anglicanæ, 138; and Bartoli, 277. I observe that Morgan in his letters always speaks of Allen in terms of respect and friendship, particularly in p. 497.

[1] Murdin, 440—444, 471. Jebb, 577. Egerton, 202, 206.

presumption of the Welshman subservient to his own views against the Scottish queen.[1]

Morgan's first application was made to Christopher Blount, a Catholic gentleman in the household of Leicester. But Blount was too cautious to compromise himself: he recommended for the hazardous office of transmitting intelligence, one Pooley, a servant to Lady Sydney, the daughter of Walsingham, and living in Walsingham's house. Pooley made repeated journeys to Paris, feigning himself a Catholic, brought letters to Mary, sent to her the tender of his services, and was intrusted with the secrets of her friends in England.[2] But he was probably at this moment—he certainly became in a short time—a spy for Walsingham.

July 20.

1586. Jan. 28.

Another and more important instrument was Gilbert Gifford, of an ancient Catholic family in Staffordshire. His father had long been a prisoner on account of his religion; his elder brother was a gentleman pensioner at court; Gilbert himself at ten years of age had been sent for his education to one of the English colleges abroad under the direction of the Jesuits. At what time, or by what means, he was seduced to pander for the artful secretary, is unknown; but in December, 1585, he came to England, and repaired to the house of Walsingham's confidential agent, the decipherer Philipps; where he was entertained as a foreigner, under the assumed name of Nicholas Cornelius. He was a young man without almost the rudiments of a beard, of simple mien and foreign manners; appeared to be well acquainted with Spain and Italy, and spoke the languages of several countries with as much

[1] See Nau's apology, Harleian MSS. 4649.

[2] Murdin, 446, 449, 451, 480, 497.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1585.

fluency as if he had been a native of each.[1] About three months before his arrival, the Scottish queen had obtained from Elizabeth a promise that Chartley in Staffordshire, a house belonging to the young earl of Essex, the son-in-law of Leicester, should be assigned for her residence during the winter. Still, to her great disappointment, she had been hitherto detained at Tutbury; but now an order was despatched for her immediate removal; and Philipps and Gifford followed her separately into Staffordshire, Philipps to join Paulet at Chartley itself,[2] Gifford to visit the family of his uncle, who resided at the distance of ten miles from Chartley. But of both the real object was the same, to organize a plot by which Mary Stuart might be induced to renew without fear her correspondence with her partisans, and to provide that such correspondence should always pass, both from her and to her, through the hands of Walsingham himself.

Dec. 24.

For this purpose they first secured the services of a brewer, in the neighbouring town of Burton, known in the correspondence by the derisive sobriquet of "the "honest man," who on a fixed day of each week, was accustomed to send his dray to Chartley with a supply of beer for the inmates. With him and with Paulet, it was arranged that "the honest man" should deliver to Paulet every parcel that he might receive, either from Gifford for Mary, or from Mary for Gifford; and that Paulet, having sent such parcels by express to Walsingham, should, on their return, deliver them the next week to "the honest man" to be forwarded by

[1] Compare the memoir of the French ambassador in Lettres de Marie, vi. 281—283, with Murdin, 459.

[2] Lettres de Marie, vi. 262.

him to the Scottish queen, or to Gifford.[1] A trial of this arrangement was now made. Nicholas Cornelius waited on the French ambassador, and received from him, to transmit to Mary, several letters which had lain at the embassy more than a year. Their arrival satisfied her with respect to the safety of the way which was now open to her of corresponding with her friends, and the haste with which she answered these letters convinced the conspirators that she entertained no suspicion of treachery.[2]

Gifford, to cover his connection with Walsingham, employed the services of a cousin or brother-in-law, living in the vicinity of London, by name Thomas Throckmorton,[3] who, if we may believe the conspirator, had no notion of the part which he was really acting. Throckmorton by one of his servants forwarded the packets to the secretary, in whose office, through the aid of Thomas Philipps, the noted decipherer, and of Arthur Gregory, a man skilled in the art of counterfeiting seals, and of restoring them after they had been broken, the letters were opened,

[1] One account states that the packets were enclosed in a case, which "the honest man" secured within the barrel containing the ale for the queen's household.—Ibid. p. 284. Another that "the "honest man" accompanied the dray himself, and concealed the case in a hollow wall, with a stone to cover it.—Camden, 479. We know not what reward he received from Walsingham for his services; but Mary made to him repeated presents. "The honest "man tellyth me that wyth the packets he had X[li] yn money, "besydes all former rewards from thys quene not unknown to you." —Paulet to Walsingham, July 5.

[2] Lettres de Marie, vi. 284—286.

[3] Ibid. In the secret correspondence Gifford is often called Pietro and Luson, Throckmorton Baru, Barnabie, and Emilio Russo. The reason is, that stenographists were accustomed to invent new alphabets in cipher, each of which substituted a new hieroglyphic, or new appellation, for those persons whose real names it was desirable to conceal.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

deciphered, and transcribed.[1] When they had gone through this process, the originals, or the copies, occasionally perhaps copies falsified by interpolations, omissions, or additional postscripts, were returned through Throckmorton and Gifford to Paulet, to be forwarded, as if they had then come for the first time into his possession. That such falsification was practised on more than one occasion, will hardly admit a doubt.[2] Whence it plainly follows that entire and implicit credit ought not to be given to any of the other documents which have come down to us from that laboratory of fraud.

Gifford in the course of the next three months crossed the sea to France, returned to England, revisited Paris, and came back again to England. All these journeys were made with the privity, both of Mary and of Walsingham. Mary was deceived by the artful pretences of the traitor that he was closely watched, and in danger of being apprehended; but he promised to leave as his "substitute" a kinsman of his at his uncle's house, and thus to provide for the safe transmission of her correspondence. He went, however, in fact, by order of Walsingham to join Morgan and Paget in Paris. By them he was admitted, as a most devoted servant of Mary Stuart, to their secret consultations, and with them he planned, if he did not originate, the conspiracy which subsequently brought the queen to the scaffold. It was in the month of June that he returned the second time, and immediately resumed his former quarters in the neighbourhood of Chartley.

[1] This is plain from the many papers in the State Paper Office indorsed by Philipps as deciphered by himself.

[2] See a plain instance in Lettres de Marie, vi. 322.

Here the reader should be informed, that for more than the last twelve months the attention of Walsingham had been also directed towards an unknown gentleman, dressed in military garb, and bearing the name of Fortescue, of whom it had been remarked, that he was a frequent visitant in the families of Catholic recusants. This circumstance awakened suspicion; and Maude, an old and experienced agent, received orders to watch the steps of the unknown, and to ascertain his real character and object. Maude was a master in the art of dissimulation. By affecting an extravagant zeal for the Catholic interest, he wormed himself into the confidence of the stranger, and discovered that Captain Fortescue was in reality Ballard, a Catholic priest, who had formerly received pay as a spy from some members of the queen's council,[1] but had for several years abandoned that disgraceful occupation. He was now in the service of Morgan; and had come to England to collect information for the exiles in Paris. Maude rendered himself so useful to Ballard in these inquiries, that the two became inseparable companions. They made together a tour along the western coast, through part of Scotland, the northern counties of England, and thence through Flanders to Paris. On their way, Ballard communicated the plans of the exiles to Allen, by whom they were disapproved; but at Paris Morgan and Paget exhorted him to persevere, and introduced him to Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador. He informed that minister that the best part of the English forces had landed with Leicester in the Low Countries; that not only the Catholics, but many of the Protestants,

[1] Lettres de Marie, vi. 288.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

were ready to espouse the cause of the queen of Scots, and that they only waited for the appearance of a foreign force to rise in her favour. Mendoza was not content with this report. He thought it too vague and uncertain, and proposed a series of points or queries, to which he required full and precise answers before he would promise in the name of his sovereign any assistance from the army of the prince of Parma. This caution of the ambassador disconcerted Morgan and Paget; new consultations were held, at which it has been already noticed that Gifford assisted as one of Mary Stuart's most trusty servants, and it was resolved that Ballard should return to England to procure satisfactory answers to the queries of Mendoza; that Babington of Dethick in Derbyshire should be solicited to undertake the deliverance of the Scottish queen from the custody of Paulet at Chartley; and that an offer, which had been made to them by Savage, a soldier of fortune, who had served in the wars of the Netherlands, to assassinate the queen of England, should be accepted. Ballard and Savage immediately set out on their way to England; and Gifford came over at the same time, to convey the intelligence to Walsingham, and to promote by his intrigues the opposite projects of both parties.[1]

Babington, on whose energy and resources so much reliance had been placed, was a young man of ancient family and ample fortune. Some years previously he

[1] Camden, 474. Murdin, 517, 527, 530. Strype, iv. 200. Howell's State Trials, 1137, 1144. Chateauneuf, the French ambassador, attributes this conspiracy at Paris entirely to Gifford, as the emissary of Walsingham. "Voilà les desseins du dit Gifford projetés à Paris par gens mal pratiqués du monde, et qui se laissèrent aller aux propositions du dit Gifford, suscité par le conseil d'Angleterre."—Lettres de Marie, vi. 287.

had been page to the earl of Shrewsbury, a situation in which he had learned to admire and to pity his lord's captive, the queen of Scots. These feelings, as he advanced in years, ripened into the most enthusiastic attachment to her interests; and he had frequently rendered her very important services; having, through his numerous connections in Derbyshire and Staffordshire, continued for years to convey to her messages and intelligence, till she was placed under the custody of Paulet.[1] From that moment every channel of communication with her was closed. Still Babington objected to any forcible attempt in her favour. It would be to do the work of her enemies; to provoke her immediate death at the hands of her warder. But now Walsingham had provided for Babington a friend and adviser, the perfidious Pooley, with whom the reader is already acquainted. In Pooley he placed unlimited confidence, and to the counsels of Pooley, according to the opinion of those who knew him best, was indebted for his subsequent fate. We are told that, when he had learned from Ballard the plan devised by the conspirators in Paris, he entered into it with the most sanguine expectations of success; he maintained, so we are told, that the assassination of Elizabeth was a matter of too great importance to be left to the good fortune of Savage alone; he would associate five of his own friends with him, who should bind themselves to make the attempt in succession, if it were necessary, one after the other. He would also find other friends, with whom he would make himself master of Chartley by surprise, and carry off the Scottish queen

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

[1] Hardwicke Papers, 226.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

before Paulet should have the opportunity of taking her life.

For some days the mind of Babington was occupied with these thoughts. Ballard and Savage sought to confirm him in his resolution; but the young men on whose co-operation he relied, the companions of his pursuits and pleasures, betrayed reluctance which he could not comprehend. It then occurred, perhaps was treacherously suggested, to him to consult the Scottish queen herself, and a letter to her was prepared, stating that, upon the representation received from Ballard, it was the resolution of himself and friends, at the risk of their lives and fortunes, to procure a sufficient force to "warrant the landing of "foreign aid, her deliverance from prison, and the "despatch of the usurping competitor;" assuring her that on the receipt of her approbation they were ready to bind themselves on the sacrament to succeed or forfeit their lives; and requesting that in her answer she would authorize them to act in her name, would give them directions for their guidance, and would promise to them rewards proportionate to their services. The reader will discover in this extraordinary document little of that caution and disguise so natural to conspirators. It looks as if it were written for the sole purpose of drawing Mary into the plot; of seducing her to furnish evidence to be afterwards used against herself. Nor should it be forgotten that Babington's letter, whatever it originally contained, would pass through the office of Walsingham, who, instead of the original, might forward a copy so interpolated and improved by Philipps, as to render it difficult for the queen to return an answer without

betraying an approval, or at least a guilty knowledge, of the proposed assassination.[1]

Above a year before this, Morgan had advised Mary to open a correspondence with Babington; but the vigilance of Paulet rendered it impracticable. Now he repeated this advice, and even enclosed the draft of a note to him, which she might adopt as her own.[2] There was something very suspicious in such presumption. However, she ordered Curle to copy it in cipher, and transmit it by the usual channel. Babington was finishing, or had just finished, his long letter already described,[3] when he received from the hands "of an unknown boy" the note from the Scottish queen, chiding him for the suspension of his correspondence, and inquiring whether he had not a packet for her from foreign parts.[4] Nothing could be more opportune. He sent to her at the same time the

[1] If we score out the line "for the despatch of the usurping conspirator," and the passage beginning, "and for the despatch of the usurper," and ending with "tragical execution," on the supposition that they are interpolations, Babington's letter will be confined to the expected aid from foreigners, and the safest way of carrying Mary off from Chartley.

[2] Was not the draft of this note fabricated in Walsingham's office? Morgan admonished Mary to have no correspondence with Ballard, "because he was engaged in an enterprise with which it "was not meet that she should be concerned."—Murdin, 527. Would he then advise her to correspond with Babington, who was supposed to be at the very head of Ballard's enterprise?

[3] Je pourrai prendre sur ma conscience, que ladite lettre (Mary's letter to him) n'avoit esté receue par ledit Babington, quand il escrivit sa longue lettre.—Nau to the queen, September 10. Lettres de Marie, vii. 209. That Nau was correct, appears from this, that Babington, in his long letter, makes no reference to this note, which he must have done if he had received it.

[4] This note was dated by her on June 25, O. S., or July 5, N. S., but was enclosed in one from Curle to Babington, dated June 24, on Saturday. Now June 24 was Friday. He had written on that day, but was obliged to wait for the queen's letter, and therefore added the words "on Saturday" as a correction of the date which he had previously given.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

packet and his own letter, which, in consequence of the arrangement already described, came in due course into the hands of Walsingham. Hitherto the secretary had kept his knowledge of the conspiracy locked up within his breast; but with this important instrument in his possession, he deemed it requisite for his own safety to communicate it to the queen, but to the queen only, and not to any member of the council. Elizabeth, alarmed at the danger to herself, insisted on the immediate apprehension of Babington and Ballard. But their apprehension would have marred the whole intrigue, for Mary yet had done nothing to affect her life. He remonstrated; his remonstrances, though they did not subdue, shook the resolution of his mistress; and whilst she took time to deliberate, he determined to proceed; for Babington had promised to be at Lichfield on the 12th of July, to receive there the answer of Mary to his letter.[1]

It was plain that on the arrival of the conspirator at Lichfield, a new arrangement on the part of Walsingham would be necessary. The vicinity of that town to Chartley would not allow of the delay which must be caused by the transmission of the correspondence to London, and of its return thence to "the "honest man." On this account Philipps and Gregory received orders to proceed to Chartley, that the letters might be deciphered on the spot.[2]

July 6.

[1] This communication is placed by Camden (480, 481) a few days later; but the following passage from a letter by Philipps shows that it had been made before the 6th of July; and that the queen was still undecided with respect to the arrest. "If by that "you finde of her maties disposition it should be necessary to lay "hands upon him in this countrie."—Phil. to Walsingham, July 6.

[2] The facts are certain; the reason here assigned is only that which appears warranted by the facts.

Philipps, on his arrival, met with a severe disappointment. He had brought with him Babington's letter to Mary, which it was important to deliver immediately, that her answer might be ready against the 12th.[1] But this required the agency of "the "honest man," who, having already engaged to visit Chartley on that day, refused to anticipate the appointed time. But, if his obstinacy disconcerted Philipps, the presence of Philipps was the cause of much disquietude to Mary. She suspected that he was the same person who, under that name, had been already recommended to her as one "likely to do her "service;" but in that case why did he visit Paulet? What could be the object of his long sojourn in the house without any apparent cause? How came he to be treated with so much respect? All this was a mystery which she sought, but was unable, to unravel.[2]

July 8.

On the 12th "the honest man" received, and delivered a letter from Babington; and on the next day gave to Paulet a note in cipher, addressed to Babington by Nau, acknowledging the receipt of the letter, and promising a satisfactory answer at the

July 12.

July 13.

[1] Paulet to Wals., July 14. Philipps on his way near Stilton met an express with a packet to Walsingham, which had come through the hands of "the honest man." He opened it, and found within a packet from Mary to the French ambassador. This he took with him to Chartley, that he might have leisure "to dispatch it there, "and send it upp fit for his handling."—Philipps to Wals., July 8.

[2] See passages about Philipps in Murdin, 455, 533. At Chartley he was treated "avec demonstrance de beaucoup de credit et de "respect," which augmented Mary's uneasiness.—Mary to Chasteauneuf, July 17. One day she caught his eye as she was passing to her carriage, and smiled. Her object was to elicit from him some token that he was Morgan's man. But her smile, he tells Walsingham, reminded him of the saying,

Si tibi dicit ave, sicut ab hoste cave.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

expiration of three days.[1] Philipps could not suppress his joy. He saw that Mary entertained no suspicion of the fraud; that she was entirely ignorant of the net which had been so artfully drawn round her for her destruction. He wrote in triumph to Walsingham, "We attend her very hart at the next."[2]

July 4.

Babington's letter reached Mary at a moment when, if we may believe Nau, her mind was in a state of irritation and despondency. Not only had new restraints been imposed on her liberty, and the few comforts to which she was accustomed been abridged, but a treaty had been recently concluded between Elizabeth and her son, in which, according to report, her right to the succession was set aside.[3] In addition, she feared—unjustly, indeed, as the sequel proved—the stern fanaticism of her keeper, and had persuaded herself that the real object of those who had introduced the bill "for the safety of the queen's person," was to murder her with impunity in her prison.[4]

[1] To Babington's letter a postscript had been appended, whether by Babington or Walsingham is uncertain, inquiring Mary's opinion of Pooley. Nau replied in her name that she had received a favourable character of the man, but had never ventured to employ him.

[2] Phil. to Wals., July 14.

[3] Nau's Protestation to Elizabeth of September 10. Mary to Chasteauneuf, July 17.

[4] In the beginning of the letter mentioned in the last note, Mary prayed to be removed from the custody of Paulet, on the ground of danger to her life, "en tous evenements, soyt de la mort de la "Royne d'Angleterre, ou insurrection dans le pays."—It may be supposed that this request arose from her knowledge of the conspiracy; but she had long been tormented with the fear of assassination under the care of Paulet, and had repeatedly begged for another keeper. Thus on July 2, O. S., in a letter to the archbishop of Glasgow, she solicited the good offices of the king of France for that purpose and on the same ground; "si ceste Royne venoyt a "failler ou s'il advenoit quelque insurrection on tumult en ce paya." These applications were made by her before she knew of Babington's conspiracy.

Under the influence of these feelings she resolved to accept the offer of liberation made to her by Babington, but at the same time to admonish him, as he valued her safety or his own, to take no step before he had secured two things,—the services of a powerful party within the realm, and the co-operation of a Spanish force from the Netherlands, which he could not expect to obtain before the beginning of autumn. With this view she composed a series of instructions for his guidance; her minute was fashioned by Nau into a letter in French; and that letter was translated by Curle into English.[1] Both the French letter by Nau, and the English version by Curle, she read and approved; and therefore, for the contents of both, she must be considered accountable. The English version

[1] On the same day, but after this answer was written, Mary received two letters from Morgan, in which were hints of the conspiracy, and advice not to correspond with Ballard.—Murdin, 527, 530. In return she referred him to her letter to Paget, in which she describes her answer to Babington as "an ample dispatch contayn-"ing poynt by poynt her advice in all things requisite, as well for "this side as for without the realm," with many of the particulars. —Murdin, 531. Yet neither in this letter nor in others written at the same time and on the same subject, to Morgan, Mendoza, the archbishop of Glasgow, &c., is there a single word allusive to the design of assassinating Elizabeth. But in *the deciphered copy* of the answer to Babington the case is otherwise. There she asks, or is made to ask, "how the six gentlemen do mean to procede," to point out the time when they should be set to work, and to mention the accomplishment of their design, which can mean nothing but the assassination of the queen.—See the letter. Still she nowhere in it "praises," as Mr. Van Raumer incautiously asserts, "the "six men, who had bound themselves by oath to murder Elizabeth, "and holds out to them the prospects of great reward" (p. 311). Probably he misunderstood the following passage. "To yorselfe "in particular I referre to assure the gentilmen above-mentioned of "all that shal be requisite on my parte for the entier execution of "their good willes," which passage, whether genuine or not, means that she will write to Mendoza and the king of Spain to aid them with troops from the Netherlands.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

by Curle was then put into cipher for Babington,[1] but whether correctly or not it was not in her power to ascertain; and this remark is made, because at her trial the minute by herself, and the French letter by Nau, which were in the hands of the prosecutors, were suppressed, and only a deciphered copy of the English version by Curle—and the copy made by we know not whom—was produced against her.

July 17. The anticipations of Philipps were now realized. "The honest man" attended on the appointed day; the important letter, in which Mary had made herself a party to the project of insurrection, if not to
July 18. that of assassination, was intrusted to his care; and he, with his usual fidelity, deposited it in the hands of
July 20. Paulet. Not a moment was lost. It was deciphered, and a copy forwarded to Walsingham.[2] The day, indeed, was past, on which Babington ought to have been at Lichfield; but the conspirator had not kept
July 24. his appointment; and Philipps, on the receipt of new instructions from the secretary, repaired with the
July 26. original to London.

Two days after his arrival, Babington, who still re-
July 29. mained in the capital, was accosted by an unknown individual, "a homely serving man in a bleue coate," who put into his hands a small packet, accompanied with a note written in a counterfeit hand without signature, and stating that the packet came from the Scottish queen, and that the writer would discover himself at the next despatch. Neither the substitution of a strange messenger, nor the mysterious tenor of the note, appears to have awakened any apprehen-

[1] Confession of Nau, September 5, 6.
[2] Philipps to Wals., July 19. Paulet to Wals., July 20.

sion. It occurred not to Babington to make inquiry how the bearer became possessed of the letter; much less to suspect the adulteration of its contents; though we are assured by Camden, that in the secretary's office a postscript had been added in the same cipher inquiring the names of the six gentlemen who had undertaken to assassinate the queen, and that other falsifications had probably been made in the body of the letter.[1]

Babington, however, was no longer the same bold and reckless conspirator who had written the treasonable letter to Mary. In the beginning of the month he discovered that his secret had been betrayed; but by whom, or to what extent, was only matter of conjecture. Loath to impeach the fidelity of his friend Pooley, he attributed the disclosure to the perfidy of Maude, and instead of proceeding, as he had promised, to Lichfield, remained in London with the open bearing of conscious innocence; procured for Ballard a passport under a counterfeit name, that he might flee beyond the sea; and through the agency, perhaps at the suggestion, of Pooley, offered his own services to

[1] Quibus subdole additum eodem charactere postscriptum, ut nomina sex nobilium ederet, si non et alia.—Camd. 479. I see no reason to dispute this testimony of Camden, though the postscript does not appear in any of the deciphered copies. As Babington returned no answer, to have deciphered the postscript could have served to no other purpose than to provoke suspicion of its authenticity. Mr. Tytler, however, discovered in the State Paper Office a scrap of paper in cipher, on which was indorsed in the hand of Philipps, "The postscript of the Scottish quene's letter to Babington." It has been deciphered by Mr. Robert Lemon, and corresponds exactly with the description of the postscript left by Camden. It is not, however, a copy of that postscript, but, in my opinion, an original draft of it; for about the middle a certain passage is scored out with a pen, and a correction substituted for the line scored out.—See it in Tytler, viii. 287; Lettres de Marie, vi. 395.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

the secretary, to act the part of a spy on the continent, and to discover the traitorous practices of Morgan, Paget, and the other exiles. But he was no match for that statesman in the art of dissimulation. Walsingham, as if he had been duped by this hypocritical display of loyalty, thanked him for his offer, promised him a warrant to travel as soon as the queen should affix her signature, and assured him that his services should be munificently rewarded.[1] His mind was now tranquillized; the receipt and decipherment of the answer from the Scottish queen opened to him a new prospect; and he wrote a hasty reply, chiefly, as it would appear, to account for his absence from Lichfield on the appointed day. That cause he attributed to the betrayal of the plot by Maude. Of his own application to Walsingham he made no mention; but he "had in part prevented the evil," and was seeking "to redress the rest." She was not therefore to despond Her cause was the cause of God, and of the church; and no danger, no difficulty should prevent him and his friends from risking their lives and their all for its success. "Wee have "vowed," he wrote, "and we will performe or dye."[2]

August 3.

The next morning revealed to him that the second part of this alternative would be his lot. His lodging was searched by pursuivants, and Ballard, who had not yet effected his escape, was apprehended. This arrest opened at last the eyes of the conspirator; he now began to think that the man whom he had hitherto cherished as a faithful friend, was the real

August 4.

[1] Philipps to Wals., July 6; also Camden, 478, who appears not to have been aware how early in the month Babington had made application to Walsingham.

[2] Babington to Mary, August 3.

traitor, and, under that impression, wrote a letter to Pooley expressive of the bitterest scorn for his perfidy, and of his own contempt of the fate to which that perfidy would expose him.[1] It is difficult to trace his steps for the next two days. We find him first consulting his friends, then repairing as a visitor, or a captive, to the house of Walsingham, and afterwards, under the covert of night, seeking, with Gage, Charnock, Barnewell, and Donne, a place of concealment in St. John's Wood.[2] August 7.

As soon as it became known that Babington had absconded, the names of the traitors were proclaimed, warrants issued, searches made, and an embargo laid on the shipping. These measures provoked the most extravagant and alarming reports, that a plot had been discovered to burn the city and murder the queen; that the papists in the country had already risen in aid of the conspirators, and that a combined force from France and Spain was actually at sea, if it had not already landed on the southern coast. The popular excitement, plainly fomented by the govern-

[1] See this letter of August 4 in note (R) at the end.

[2] From the confession of Savage in State Trials, it would appear that Babington fled on the 5th (i. 1131); from the letter of Chasteauneuf of the 9th, that he was taken on Thursday the 7th, carried before Walsingham at his country house, and delivered in charge to two of the secretary's servants, from whom he made his escape.—Egerton, 73. Camden has a more romantic story. Babington complained by letter to Walsingham at Windsor of the arrest of Ballard, who was necessary for the success of his own mission to the continent, and received for answer that Ballard had been taken as a missionary priest, and that he himself would run the risk of being taken as the harbourer of a priest, unless he sought shelter for the night in Walsingham's house; that Babington followed this advice; but finding that he was in reality a prisoner under the charge of Scudamore and others, he gave them a supper at a tavern, and afterwards, rising as if it was to pay the bill, and leaving his cloak and sword behind him, made his escape.—Camd. p. 481.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

ment, rose to such a height, that the foreign ambassadors were exposed to insults and menaces in their own houses, and Catholics and strangers sought to conceal themselves under the fear of a general massacre.[1] At length Walsingham, who had never lost sight of the fugitives, gave orders for their apprehension. Compelled by hunger to quit St. John's Wood, they had repaired to Harrow, to a friendly family of the name of Bellamy, by whom they had been received and concealed in the outhouses and

August 15.

gardens. There they were taken; and were conducted thence, under a strong guard, to the Tower, amidst the shouts of the populace, the ringing of bells, and the usual demonstrations of public triumph.[2] In a short time Abingdon, Salisbury, Tichbourne, Travers, and Tilney were brought up in custody to the same prison; and of all the intimate friends of Babington, one only, Edward Windsor, the brother of the lord Windsor, had the good fortune to elude the vigilance of the pursuivants. But what, it may be asked, became of the pretended friends of Babington, the agents of the secretary? Gifford, the moment his perfidy was about to be disclosed, on the first day

July 30.

after the transmission of Mary's answer to Babington, in company with Savage and an unknown person, applied to the secretary of the French embassy for the means of sending a messenger to Mary's friends in Paris. He was told that, if the messenger were willing to act as servant to Dujardin, he might go the next evening, as soon as the tide served. The unknown person was understood to be the messenger. But at the appointed hour Gifford himself appeared,

[1] Chasteauneuf, August 24. Egerton, 74.
[2] Camden, 481.

saying that he had determined to carry the message himself, took up the portmanteau, and followed Dujardin.[1] Thus he escaped the vengeance which he feared from the kinsmen of those whom he had betrayed in England, but not that of the kinsmen of Mary Stuart in France. Soon after his arrival, he was thrown into prison, on account of disorderly conduct. There they bound him, and there they kept him in close confinement till his death in 1590. Pooley was more fortunate. Walsingham shut him up for protection in the Tower, where he remained till he could be discharged without attracting notice, or incurring danger.[2]

The Scottish queen had been kept in profound ignorance of all these events. When the secretary laid her answer to Babington before the council, it had been resolved to make a seizure of her papers, and to subject her to more rigorous restraint; and Paulet, on the receipt of his instructions, had replied in the pious cant of the day, that he would "execute "them with the grace of God." One morning Mary took an airing, attended by her keeper with more than his usual escort. To her surprise, she was not suffered to return. Her tears and entreaties, her refusal and offer of resistance, were of no avail. She was taken to Tixall, a house about three miles distant, belonging to Sir Walter Aston; and there two rooms only were allotted for her accommodation; the use of pen, ink, and paper was refused to her; and every

August 8.

[1] He persevered in his treachery to the last, having left with the ambassador a certain paper and instructions to trust letters, received from Mary or from her friends abroad, to such person only as should bring with him the counterpart of that paper. The counterpart he had already deposited in Walsingham's office.—Camd. 483.

[2] Camden, 482, 483.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. means of acquiring information was carefully excluded. Whilst she remained at Tixall, Sir William Wade arrived at Chartley with instructions to break open her cabinets, and seize upon her papers, letters, alphabets in cipher, money, jewels, and caskets. But her caskets were the chief object of the royal solicitude. A special messenger was despatched to superintend the packing of the caskets, and the delivery of them into the queen's own hands.[1] If she expected to find among them the so much coveted casket with Mary's letters and sonnets to Bothwell, she was disappointed; but she received many valuable jewels, and, what was of greater importance, Mary's secret papers, with her own minute of her letter to Babington, and the original letter composed by Nau in the French language.[2] Wade, with his prize, and with the two secretaries and Pasquier as prisoners, returned to London, and Paulet received orders to conduct the captive queen back to Chartley. As she walked to her carriage through a crowd of poor people assembled at the gate, expecting to partake of her usual bounty, "Alas," she said to them with tears, "I have "nothing to give you. I am a beggar as well as you. "All is taken from me." When she entered her former apartment, and saw her cabinets opened, and her seals and papers gone, she paused for a moment, and then turning to Paulet, said with an air of dignity, "There still remain two things, Sir, which you cannot "take from me, the royal blood which gives me a

August 23.

August 25.

[1] See the inventory, Lettres de Marie, vii. 244. I do not believe that there was any casket in the cabinet.

[2] Nau, in his apology, says that Mary had kept them against his frequent remonstrances. "Plusiers lettres et papiers pris dans le "cabinet de la Royne, où contre mes instantes remonstrances et "advis ils avoint ete gardez et reservez."

"right to the succession, and the attachment which "binds me to the faith of my fathers."[1]

After a short time spent in preparation, Babington and his fellows, fourteen in number, were brought to trial. The indictment charged them with a twofold conspiracy, a plot to murder the queen, and another to raise a rebellion within the realm in favour of Mary Stuart; but of any intention to proceed against Mary Stuart herself, or of any suspicion that she had approved of such designs, not a hint was suffered to transpire. This the queen had expressly forbidden, in opposition to her legal advisers, under the notion that it might compromise her own safety. Of the prisoners, Babington, Ballard, Savage, Barnewell, Tichbourne, and Donne, admitted their guilt as to one or other of these plots, and were therefore convicted on their own confessions; of the remaining seven, who pleaded not guilty, five were convicted as accomplices

Sept. 13. Sept. 14. Sept. 15.

[1] For these particulars see extracts from the letters of Paulet and of D'Esneval, in Chalmers, i. 429, 430; and Tytler, viii. 300; Von Raumer, iii. 315, 316. It is to this period that I attribute Elizabeth's celebrated letter to Paulet. "Amyas, my most faithful servant, "God reward thee treblefold in the double for thy most trouble- "some charge, so well discharged. If you knew, my Amyas, how "kindly, besides dutifully, my grateful heart accepteth your double "labours, and faithful actions, your wise orders, and safe conduct "performed in so dangerous and crafty a charge, it would ease your "travel, and rejoice your heart, in that I cannot balance in any "weight of my judgment the value that I prize you at; and suppose "no treasure to countervail such a faith; and shall condemn "myself in that fault which I never committed, if I reward not such "deserts. Yea, let me lack when I have most need, if I acknow- "ledge not such a merit with a reward non omnibus datum." She proceeds to tell him, that he should exhort Mary to repent. "Her "vile deserts compel these orders: no excuse can serve, it being so "plainly confessed by the actors of my guiltless death."—Strype, iii. 361. He never received this great reward non omnibus datum; but the reason is evident. The reader will afterwards see, that he refused to put Mary to death without a warrant, though Elizabeth asked him to do it.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. on the questionable authority of passages extracted from the confessions of the others, and two, Gage and Bellamy, as accessaries after the fact, because they had aided and abetted the conspirators after the proclamation. Two successive days were allotted for their execution. The queen, whether it was to gratify resentment, or to terrify by example, had wished that they might suffer some kind of death more barbarous and excruciating than the usual punishment of treason; but when it was represented to her that such an alteration would be illegal, she consented that the law should have its course, on condition that the executions were "protracted to the extremitie of payne" in them, and in the full sight of the people. On the Sept. 20. first day she was obeyed; but the youth, the rank, and the demeanour of the sufferers so powerfully excited the pity, and the barbarity of the punishment the horror, of the spectators, that it was deemed Sept. 21. prudent to concede something to public feeling; and on the next morning the remaining seven were allowed to expire on the gallows, before their bodies were subjected to the knife of the executioner.[1]

There was much in the fate of these young men to claim the sympathy of the reader. They were not of that class in which conspirators are generally found. Sprung from the best families in their respective counties, possessed of affluent fortunes, they had hitherto kept aloof from political intrigue, and de-

[1] See their trials, and the harrowing detail of their sufferings, in Howell, i. 1127—1158; Camden, 483; and two letters from Burghley to Hatton, in possession of Mr. Leigh. Bellamy's brother had died in prison, and Mrs. Bellamy escaped, because she had been indicted, perhaps purposely, by the name of Elizabeth instead of Catherine.—Howell, 1141. Sir Walter Raleigh had the good fortune to obtain the grant of Babington's lands.—Murdin, 785.

voted their time to the pursuits and pleasures befitting their age and station. Probably had it not been for the perfidious emissaries of Morgan and Walsingham, —of Morgan, who sought to revenge himself on Elizabeth, and of Walsingham, who cared not whose blood he shed, provided he could shed that of Mary Stuart, none of them would have even thought of the offence for which they suffered.[1] There were gradations in their guilt. Babington was an assassin; he sought to promote the murderous project of Ballard and Savage, though no particular plan had been selected, no definitive resolution adopted. Of the rest, Abingdon, Salisbury, and Donne refused to imbrue their hands in the blood of the English, but offered to co-operate in the liberation of the Scottish queen; the others condemned both projects; their real offence consisted in their silence; they scorned to betray the friends who confided in their honour. "It was my hard fate," exclaimed Jones at the bar, "that I must either "betray my friend whom I love as myself, or break "my allegiance, and undo myself and my posterity. "I desired to be accounted a faithful friend, and am "condemned as a false traitor. The love of Thomas "Salisbury has made me hate myself: but God knows "how far I was from intending treason."[2]

[1] "Before this thing chanced," says Tichbourne, on the scaffold, "we lived together in most flourishing estate. Of whom went "report in the Strand, Fleet-street, and elsewhere about London, "but of Babington and Tichbourne? No threshold was of force to "brave our entry. Thus we lived, and wanted nothing we could "wish for; and God knows what less in my head than matters of "state!—I always thought it impious, and denied to be a dealer "in it; but in regard of my friend, I was silent, and so consented." —Howell, 1157. He was much pitied by the spectators. Two of his compositions, a short poem written on the evening before his execution, and a letter to his wife on the very morning, have been published by Mr. D'Israeli, Curiosities of Literature, iii. 105.

[2] Howell, i. 1151—1155.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

We may now return to the history of the Scottish queen. Elizabeth hated her before as a rival; after the perusal of her answer, or reputed answer, to Babington, she sought to revenge herself on her as a murderer; and refused both to listen to the arguments of those who wished to extenuate her offence, or to admit the solicitations of those who hoped to screen her from punishment.[1] In the council a voice or two pleaded faintly in her favour; but the more influential of the royal advisers would not allow the opportunity to slip from their grasp, and maintained that the death of Mary was indispensably requisite for the security of their religion,[2] suppressing, what at the same time they really felt, that it was still more necessary for their own safety. But how was the life of the captive to be taken? Leicester, in his despatches from Holland, recommended the sure but silent operation of poison;[3] Walsingham, on the contrary, advised, as more honourable to the sovereign, the form and solemnity of a public trial; and it was at length agreed in council, that the queen of Scots should be removed to the Tower; that she should be brought before a court of delegates, according to the provisions of the act for the better security of the royal person; and that her condemnation by that court should be afterwards ratified in parliament. Thus, as it is expressed by Burghley, they would "make the burden "better born, and the world abrod better satisfyced."[4] To the tribunal which they had suggested, the queen readily gave her assent; but she objected to the ratifi-

[1] Chasteauneuf, September 13, in Egerton, 78, 79.

[2] Camden, 485.

[3] He even sent a divine over to prove the lawfulness of his proposal.—Ibid.

[4] Ellis, iii. 5.

cation in parliament, and with respect to the place of confinement indulged in her usual vacillation. She would not hear of the Tower, for Mary had partisans in the city; to it she preferred the castle of Hertford. But the next day Hertford was too near; Fotheringhay, which was then proposed, was too distant; to Woodstock, Grafton, Coventry, Northampton, and Huntingdon she objected, that they were either insecure or inconvenient; nor was it till she could no longer procrastinate, that she fixed on the castle of Fotheringhay.[1]

It was foreseen that Mary would confine her defence to the denial of all participation in the plot for the *murder* of Elizabeth. Now, as we have seen, Walsingham held in his possession the minute of her answer to Babington in her own hand, with the answer itself in the French language written by Nau; and it is plain that either of these was sufficient to bring home the charge to the accused, if either of them contained the murderous passages afterwards alleged against her. Yet—and it suggests a strong presumption in her favour—neither of these important documents was produced during the proceedings; not a hint of their existence was suffered to transpire. Walsingham undertook to procure evidence of her guilt from the confessions of her two secretaries,[2] whom he kept in confinement in his own house,

[1] Ellis, iii. 3. Chalmers, i. 383.

[2] Confessions of September 2, 3. Though it appears from Burghley's letters of September 4 and 8, that up to that time they had confessed nothing of importance, yet Walsingham had the face to inform the French ambassador before August 28, O. S., that they had already confessed more than was wanted,—"plusque "l'on ne vouloit;" and Hatton, on the 8th or 9th of September, that Nau had confessed the whole,—"recogneu et confessé tout."—Egerton, 76, 78.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. secluded from all communication with their friends, and beset with men urging them to betray the secrets, and to bear testimony to the wicked designs of their
Sept. 2. mistress. Yielding to these solicitations, and to their
Sept. 3. own apprehensions, they offered to reveal the whole truth; but their first statements disappointed the expectation of the council. They amounted to nothing more than an acknowledgment that Nau had written in French, and Curle had translated and put into cipher, by order of Mary, three letters to Babington; that is, the notes of June 15th and July 12th, and the long answer to his letter on July 17th. Lord Burghley attributed this reserve to their notion that they might be punished as accomplices in the
Sept. 4. plot, and thought, as he wrote to Hatton, that "they "wold yeld sōewhat to confirm ther mystriss crymes, "if they war persuaded that themselves might scape, "and the blow fall upon ther M^rs betwixt hir head "and hir shoulders."[1] The documents were then laid before them. The two first they readily acknow-
Sept. 5. ledged;[2] but, if it be true that they were asked to
Sept. 6. authenticate with their signatures the deciphered copy of the answer to Babington, it is plain that they objected, and, if they admitted it at all, that admission was accompanied with qualifications which rendered the admission of no value. They were now threat-
Sept. 10. ened with the Tower, a threat which implied the infliction of torture; and Nau in his terror wrote to the queen a most urgent supplication for mercy, enclosing what he called his protestation, or disclosure of all that he knew, "upon his salvation;" of which the sum was, that the letter from Babington did,

[1] Burghley to Hatton, September 4, from Mr. Leigh's collection.
[2] Burghley to Walsingham, September 8.—Ellis, iii. 5.

indeed, contain an allusion to her death, but that Mary took no notice of it, because it was a thing which she neither desired nor intended, though she did not think herself obliged to disclose it.[1] A short respite followed. But the day after the butchery of Babington and his companions, on the very morning on which the other seven victims were drawn to Tyburn, when it might be expected that the fear of similar punishment would render the two secretaries more tractable and communicative, they were summoned before Bromley the lord chancellor, Lord Burghley, and Sir Christopher Hatton, commissioners appointed by the queen to examine them officially.[2] After several questions respecting the manner in which Mary's letters were prepared, there was put into their hands—not the deciphered copy of the answer to Babington, on the fidelity of which the whole question turned—but "an abstract of the principal points" contained in it; and they were required to say upon oath whether they could not recall those points to their recollection. It is stated that both answered in the affirmative without any exception;[3] but the language of the official record is so very ambiguous, as to render it a matter of doubt whether they comprehended in those answers the murderous passages which Mary afterwards disclaimed.[4]

Sept. 21.

Of all these proceedings the captive at Chartley was ignorant. When her papers were carried away, her

[1] Von Raumer, iii. 329.

[2] Their preceding confessions had been "offered."—Ellis, iii. 5. Henceforth they were compulsory, and made before the commissioners. For this reason Nau remarks that Babington and his friends were executed, "avant que l'on me fist jamais un seul interrogation."—Nau, Apologie.

[3] Hardwicke Papers, 236.

[4] See note at the end (S)

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

money had been left by the commissioners; this was now taken, that she might not employ it to tempt the fidelity of Paulet or his assistants;[1] and shortly afterwards she received an order to prepare for her removal at the end of two days to another house. That house, on her arrival, she found to be the castle of Fotheringhay, in Northamptonshire, the place selected for her trial and death. At Windsor irresolution still prevailed; new questions continually arose; council after council was held, and the intended proceedings were repeatedly postponed. At last a commission was issued to forty-six individuals, peers, privy counsellors, and judges, constituting them a court to inquire into and determine all offences committed against the statute of the 27th of the queen, either by Mary, daughter and heiress of James V., late king of Scotland, or by any other person whomsoever.[2] Chasteauneuf immediately demanded in the name of his sovereign that Mary might have the assistance of counsel, according to the practice of all other nations; to which a verbal answer was returned through Hatton, that the queen wanted not the advice of others, nor did she believe that he had been ordered by his master "to school *her:*" and that, as the civil law considered prisoners in the situation of Mary Stuart unworthy of counsel, she did not, by the refusal of such aid, depart from the ordinary forms of justice.[3]

Sept. 10.

Sept. 24.

Oct. 5.

Oct. 7.

Oct. 9.

[1] Her money amounted to 107*l.* 2s. in English coin, and to five rouleaux of French crowns, three of which were equal to one pound. At the same time were seized two thousand crowns, the portion which Mary had formerly given to Curle's wife at her marriage, and a gold chain and several different sums belonging to Nau, of the value of 1,545*l.* 18s. Three pounds in silver were left with Mary to pay the wages of some of her servants.—Ellis, iii. 7—11.

[2] Camden (486) recites it at length.

[3] Chasteauneuf, October 10, in Egerton, 84, 85.

On the eleventh of October six-and-thirty of the commissioners arrived at the castle.[1] The following day the Scottish queen remained in her chamber under the pretence of indisposition, but admitted Mildmay and Paulet with a notary to deliver to her a letter from Elizabeth, announcing the object of these proceedings. She read it with an air of composure, and turning to them said, "I am sorry to be "charged by my sister the queen with that of which "I am innocent; but let it be remembered that I am "also a queen, and not amenable to any foreign "jurisdiction."[2] Oct. 11. Oct. 12.

The next day, having nerved her mind for the meeting, she received deputations from the commissioners, and conversed with them in the hall of the castle. There were four interviews; but no reasoning of the lawyers, no threat of proceeding against her for contumacy, could shake her resolution. She maintained that the statute of the 27th of the queen could not bind her; she was no party to it; Oct. 13.

[1] They were Bromley lord chancellor, Burghley lord treasurer, the earls of Oxford, Kent, Derby, Worcester, Rutland, Cumberland, Warwick, Pembroke, and Lincoln; the viscount Montague; the lords Abergavenny, Zouch, Morley, Stafford, Grey, Lumley, Stourton, Sandys, Wentworth, Mordaunt, St. John of Bletso, Compton, and Cheney; Sir James Croft, Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Ralph Sadler, Sir Walter Mildmay, and Sir Amyas Paulet; Wray and Anderson, chief justices of the Common Pleas and Queen's Bench; Manwood, chief baron of the Exchequer; and Gaudy and Periam, justices of the Common Pleas and Queen's Bench. Yet Cumberland is not named in the commission.

[2] Camden, 490. During this discussion, she observed repeatedly that she could not comprehend that passage in the queen's letter which said that she was living in England under the queen's protection. She therefore requested an explanation of it from Bromley, the chancellor. It was rather a puzzling question. His reply was evasive; that the meaning was plain enough; but that it was not for subjects to interpret the letters of their sovereign, nor had they come there for that purpose.—Howell, 1169, 1170. Camd. 492.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. it was contrived by her enemies, and passed for her ruin. Whence did the commissioners derive their authority? From their queen? but that queen was only her equal, not her superior. Let them find persons who were her peers; and let such sit in judgment upon her. She was aware that these objections could not save her, for the queen's letter proved that she was condemned already; but she would never be the person to degrade the Scottish crown, nor stand as a criminal at the bar of an English court of justice.[1]

An expression, however, had fallen from Hatton in the course of conversation which exceedingly distressed the unfortunate captive; that, if she refused to plead, the world would attribute her obstinacy to consciousness of guilt. In the silence and solitude of the night the high tone of her mind insensibly relaxed; in the morning she received a harsh and imperious note from the queen, who, after the charge of seeking her death and the destruction of the realm, proceeded thus: "Wherefore our pleasure is that "you make answer to the nobles and peers of my "kingdom as you would answer to myself, if I were "present. Therefore I order, charge, and command "you to answer to them; for I have heard of your "arrogance. But act candidly, and you may meet with "more favour. Elizabeth."[2] It was, probably, this last line that turned the balance. It held out a faint gleam of hope; and Mary informed the commissioners that she was content to waive her objection, but only

Oct. 14.

[1] Camd. 490—494.

[2] Of this note we have not the original. Chasteauneuf, however, assures the king of France that he had translated it "mot à mot de phraze Angloise."—October 20, in Egerton, 86

on condition that her protest against the authority of the court should be entered on the record of their proceedings. To this, after some demur, they assented.

It was, perhaps, unwise in the Scottish queen to make this concession. She was placed in a situation in which, though she might assert, it was impossible that she could prove her innocence. A single and friendless female, the inmate of a prison for the last nineteen years, ignorant of law, unpractised in judicial forms, without papers, or witnesses, or counsel, and with no other knowledge of the late transactions than the reports collected by her female servants, nor of the proofs to be adduced by her adversaries but what her own conjectures might supply, she could be no match for that array of lawyers, judges, and statesmen, who sat marshalled against her; and if among the commissioners she espied two or three secret friends, they were men whose fidelity was suspected, and whose lives and fortunes probably depended on their vote of that day; the rest comprised the most distinguished of those who for years had sought her death in the council, or had clamorously called for it in parliament. Yet under all these disadvantages she defended herself with spirit and address. For two days she kept at bay the hunters of her life; on the third the proceedings were suspended by an adjournment to Westminster.[1]

The charge against the Scottish queen, like that against Babington, had been divided into two parts;

[1] Lord Burghley, however, as if she did not labour under sufficient disadvantages, composed and circulated during the trial a paper, which he called "a note of the indignities and wrongs "offered by the queen of Scots to the queen's majesty."—See it in Murdin, 584.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

that she had conspired with foreigners and traitors to procure, 1. The invasion of the realm; 2. The death of the queen. In proof of the first part was adduced a multitude of letters, either intercepted or found in her cabinet, between her and Mendoza, Morgan, Paget, and others. These, if they were genuine, and of that there can be little doubt, showed that she had not only approved the plan of invasion devised at Paris, but had offered to aid its execution, by inducing her friends in Scotland to rise in arms, to seize the person of James, and to prevent the march of succours to England.[1] Mary, though she refused to admit, did not deny the charge in general. She treated it as frivolous. She was not bound, she said, by their statutes; she was the equal, not the subject of Elizabeth; and between equals and sovereigns there was no other law but the law of nature. That law fully authorized her to seek her deliverance from an unjust captivity.[2] She had proposed terms, offered securities, and then had claimed the right of employing every resource in her power for the recovery of her liberty. Yet her prayers, her offers, her warnings had been despised. Where was the man that could blame her, if, in such circumstances, she had accepted the

[1] This project to seize the person of James, and carry him out of the kingdom, did her much harm. Yet it would have been fair to recollect that it was suggested to her by the conduct of her enemies, who had repeatedly made themselves masters of the royal person, and of Elizabeth, who had as often required that the king should be sent into England. Another letter was read, in which she expressed an intention of bequeathing to the Spanish king her right to the succession to the English throne.—Hardwicke Papers, 247. In return she merely observed that she had been forced to such measures. Her enemies had deprived her of all hope in England; she was therefore compelled to purchase friends abroad.—Howell, 1188.

[2] Je ne le nye pas: et s'il estoit encore à faire, je le feray, comme j'ay faict, pour chercher ma liberté.—Egerton, 103.

tenders of aid which were made to her by her friends?

With respect to the second charge, that she had conspired the death of the queen, she denied it with tears, and solemnly called on God to bear witness to her innocence.[1] The crown lawyers produced in proof, first, the copy of the letter from Babington, in which occurred this passage: "For the despatch "of the usurper, from the obedience of whom by the "excommunication of her we are made free, there be "six noble gentlemen, all my private friends, who, "for the zeal they bear to the Catholic cause and "your majesty's service, will undertake the tragical "execution:" and then a copy of seven points for deliberation, said to be extracted from her answer to Babington; of which points the sixth was, "by "what meanes doe the six gentilmen deliberate to "procede?"[2] There were other passages in the same copy equally allusive to the design of the six gentlemen; but the prosecutors insisted particularly on this. It established, they maintained, her participation with Babington in the crime of imagining and compassing the death of the queen.

It should, however, be remembered that the papers exhibited to the court were only copies. No attempt was made to show what had become of the originals, or when, where, or by whom the copies had been taken. On these points the crown lawyers observed

[1] "Si oncques j'ai dispose n'y consenty à telles practiques que "touchassent la mort de ma sœur, je prie Dieu qu'il ne me face "jamais mercy."—Ibid.

[2] It bears an awkward and therefore suspicious appearance, that while the language in the other points is affirmative, in this point, placed in the midst of them, it should assume an interrogative form. The reader wonders how the question came there.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

a mysterious silence. They deemed it sufficient to show that there had once been originals with which the copies corresponded; and for that purpose they adduced, 1. A confession of Babington that he had written a letter to Mary, and had received an answer, containing similar passages, and that he believed these copies faithful transcripts of the originals: 2. The confessions, perhaps garbled[1] and misrepresented confessions, of Nau and Curle, from which it seemed to follow that the manner of proceeding by the six gentlemen was one of the subjects recommended for deliberation by Mary: 3. The admission in several of her letters to her foreign correspondents that she had received from the conspirators notice of their intentions, and had given to them instructions on the several heads. These confessions and admissions amounted, it was maintained, to satisfactory proof of the authenticity of the copies.

At first the Scottish queen, in ignorance of the proofs to be brought forward, refused to acknowledge any correspondence between herself and Babington; but, after the production and lecture of the letters, she admitted, without hesitation, her note of the 5th of July, N. S., but resolutely denied that she had ever written any *such* answer as that of the date of July 17. "She protested," says Burghley, "that the "poynts of the lettres that concerned the practise "against the Q. Ma^ts. person was never by hir wrytten, "nor of hir knolledg."[2] She contended that, if her adversaries had really sought to discover the truth,

[1] Of such garbling being used in state prosecutions, the reader will meet with abundant proof in the history of the next reign.

[2] Burghley to Davison, October 15.—Ellis, 111, 112. Hardwicke Papers, i. 233.

instead of putting Babington to death they would have produced him to bear testimony against her; that his confession, if he made it, was of no value, because it was probably dictated by the hope of mercy; that she knew not what Nau and Curle might have been led to acknowledge, for Nau was timid and simple, and Curle the constant follower of Nau; it might be that they had confessed what was false under the notion that they would thus save their own lives without endangering hers; that this was not the first time that her letters had been copied and interpolated; it was easy for one man to imitate the ciphers and handwriting of another; it had been lately done in France, and she greatly feared that it had also been done in England by Walsingham, to bring her to the scaffold; for Walsingham, if she were rightly informed, had before this been practising against her life and that of her son. At these words the secretary rose, and protested before God, that in his private capacity he had done nothing unbecoming an honest man, nor as a public officer anything unworthy of his place. Though his answer was rather an evasion than a denial of the charge, Mary prayed him not to be offended; she had spoken freely what she had heard, and hoped that he would give no more credit to those who slandered her than she did to those who accused him.[1] She renewed her declaration that she knew nothing of the obnoxious passages; and asked for her papers—with them she might perhaps explain the mystery—and

[1] Camden, 499. From part of Walsingham's answer—"If I "had employed Ballard to plot for me, why did he not say so, to "save his life?" it is plain that Mary had accused him of employing Ballard to get up the plot. If, instead of Ballard, she had named Maude, the companion of Ballard, she would not have been far from the truth.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. for her secretaries—were they confronted with her, the truth might soon be elicited—at present they ought to be considered unworthy of credit. They had been sworn to keep her secrets: if they had accused her truly, they had perjured themselves to her; if falsely, they had perjured themselves to the queen of England.

It is plain that, since the authenticity of the copy was disputed, there remained but two ways of solving the difficulty: the first and most satisfactory, by the production of the original minute and letter, which were in the hands of Walsingham; and if that could not be granted, by confronting Nau and Curle with their mistress, to which Elizabeth had with some reluctance assented. Both, however, for reasons best known to the prosecutors, were refused; and Mary demanded to be heard in full parliament, or before the queen in council, who, she persuaded herself, would not refuse that favour to a sister queen. Then Oct. 15. rising with an air of confidence, and addressing a few words aside to the lord treasurer, the earl of Warwick, Hatton, and Walsingham, she retired to her own apartment. The commissioners, after a short consultation, adjourned the court, to meet again in the Star-chamber at Westminster, on the twenty-fifth of October.[1]

[1] Camden, 506. Burghley, writing the same day, says of Mary's defence, "Gret debate fell yesternight very long, and this day renewed with gret stomaking." He assigns the following reasons for the adjournment: that, though the commissioners were ready to give judgment, they could not do it till the record were drawn up, which would occupy five or six days. Now, as their company amounted to about two thousand persons, they could not remain there so long without causing "a waste of bread greater than the country could bear."—Burghley to Davison, October 15. Ellis, iii. 13. But Walsingham informs the ambassadors at foreign courts that the adjournment "was thought convenient in respect the

On that day, notwithstanding the reclamation of the French ambassador, the court was opened in the presence of a numerous assemblage of members belonging to both houses of parliament. Care was now taken to bring forward the two secretaries,—not, however, that they might be confronted with Mary, who was absent, immured in the castle of Fotheringhay,—but that they might affirm the truth of the depositions which they had previously made. This they certainly did; but, if we may believe Nau, it was not all. He moreover maintained, as he had on all occasions maintained, that the principal heads of accusation, those on which alone could be based any pretext for condemnation, were false. Walsingham rose with warmth, reproached him with speaking contrary to his conscience, and endeavoured to silence him with the depositions of the conspirators already executed, and of some of Mary's servants. But Nau repeated his former assertion, summoned the commissioners to answer before God and all Christian kings and princes, if on such false charges they should condemn a queen, no less a sovereign than their own; and loudly demanded that this his protestation should be entered on the record.[1] But his efforts were fruitless. With the exception of the lord Zouch on the separate charge of assassination, the commissioners

"matter touched a person of her qualitie."—Wright, ii. 320. In fact, on October 7, the queen had forbidden the commissioners to proceed to the sentence against her. "We find it meet, and it is "our pleasure, that you forbear the pronouncing thereof, until such "time as you (Burghley and his colleagues) shall have made your "personal return to our presence, and report to us your proceedings "and opinions in that behalf."—Nicolas, Life of Davison, p. 48.

[1] In the same despatch Walsingham declares that "Nau and "Curle openly affirmed as much *viva voce* as they had before de-"posed in writing." But that writing, as the reader knows, was far from being conclusive.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. — Oct. 29.

unanimously gave judgment, that after the last session of parliament, and before the date of their commission, Mary, daughter of James V., commonly called queen of Scotland, and pretending title to the crown of England, had, with the aid and abettance of her secretaries, Nau and Curle, compassed and imagined divers matters tending to the hurt, death, and destruction of the queen, contrary to the form of the statute specified in the commission. This, by the act, was equivalent to a sentence of death against all the three, to be carried into execution at the pleasure of the queen. A provision was, however, added, that the judgment against the mother should not derogate from the right or dignity of her son, James, king of Scotland, but that he should continue in the same place, rank, and right, as if it had never been pronounced.[1] The judgment was then entered in the form of a record, and afterwards subscribed by the several commissioners, even by those who had not attended at Fotheringhay.[2]

The life of the Scottish queen now lay at the mercy of Elizabeth. From foreign powers, she could expect no effectual relief. The Spanish monarch had to maintain his ground in Flanders against the combined army of the insurgents and the English; the king of France, harassed by religious wars, might entreat, but could not intimidate; and with respect to her son, the Scottish king, it was plain that his claim to the succession would render him unwilling, and the English pensioners in his council would render him unable, to draw the sword in her defence. But indecision was one of the leading traits in the

[1] Camden, 507. Chasteauneuf in Egerton, 86, 83, 89. Statutes of Realm, iv. 703.

[2] See note (T).

character of her adversary. Elizabeth, while her object was at a distance, pressed towards it with impatience; but always hesitating to grasp it when it came within her reach. The death-warrant of her rival lay ready for her signature; but sometimes her imagination conjured up phantoms of danger from the desperation of Mary's partisans, and the resentment of James and the Catholic powers; sometimes she shuddered at the infamy which would cover her name, if she shed the blood of a kinswoman and a sovereign. As was usual, she sought refuge in procrastination. An interval of a month or two would persuade the world that she was reluctant to take the life of Mary; in the meantime that princess might die a natural death; she might be despatched by secret violence; at all events, the execution might be performed without the knowledge of the queen, or appear to be wrung from her by the voice of the people.[1]

Anticipating the conviction of her prisoner, Elizabeth had summoned a parliament to meet on the fifteenth of October; the length of the trial at Fotheringhay compelled her to prorogue it to the twenty-ninth of the same month. The proceedings on the trial were laid before each house; the commissioners,

[1] Je ne voudrais pas asseurer que la Royne face exécuter le jugement, mais comme il sera donné, les ennemys de la Royne d'Eccosse la pourront quelque jour prendre de telle humeur que l'execution en pourra suivre un matin, devant qu'on y ait pensé, et puis on dira qu'elle est morte d'un catarre.—Chasteauneuf, Oct. 27. Egerton, 89. He was mistaken. Elizabeth's counsellors sought indeed the death of Mary, for their own security as well as that of the queen. Burghley feared that Elizabeth's "slackness did not stand with her "suretie or *their own*."—Burghley to Leicester, October 26. Walsingham believed the death of Mary necessary "for her majesties "preservation and her *servants*" (Wal. to Shrewsbury, October 6); but, for that very reason her servants wished it to take place openly, and in consequence of the judgment already given.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. in long speeches, maintained the guilt of the royal prisoner; and the Lords and Commons united in a petition, that speedy execution might be done upon the convict. Elizabeth, after many thanks for their loyalty, replied that she would take time to deliberate, and "commend herself to be directed by God's "Spirit;" and then asked the question, whether no Nov. 14. expedient could be devised to secure her own life from danger, and at the same time spare her the necessity of taking that of her kinswoman. When the question was put, the members rose in their places, and pronounced such an expedient impossible. Nov. 25. The chancellor and speaker communicated the result to the queen; and Elizabeth returned this ambiguous answer: "If I should say that I meant not to grant "your petition, by my faith, I should say unto you "more perhaps than I mean. And if I should say "that I mean to grant it, I should tell you more than "is fit for you to know. Thus I must deliver to you "an answer answerless."[1]

The unwelcome task of announcing these proceedings to the Scottish queen was imposed on Lord Buck-

[1] Lords' Journals, 124, 125. Howell, 1189—1201. D'Ewes, 380. Puckering, the speaker, to induce her to grant the execution, made use of two singular arguments. 1. Those who had signed the association were bound, by their oath, to kill the queen of Scots. If they should do it without license, they would incur the indignation of her majesty; if they did not do it, they would be perjured, and incur the indignation of God. 2. Not only the life, but the salvation of her majesty was at stake. She would offend God by sparing the wicked princess whom God had delivered into her hands to be put to death. She should beware of imitating Saul, who had spared Agag, and Ahab, who had spared Benhadad.—D'Ewes, 401. Sir James Croft, who seems to have excelled all others in religious cant, moved that some earnest and devout prayer to God, to incline her majesty's heart to grant the petition, might be composed and printed, in order to be used daily in the house of Commons, and by its members in their chambers and lodgings.—Ibid. 404.

hurst in company with Beale, the clerk of the council. Armed with instructions and a mass of documents from Walsingham's office, they proceeded to Fotheringhay, and were introduced to the Scottish queen together with her keepers, Paulet and Drury. Buckhurst informed her that he was come by order of Elizabeth to acquaint her with the proceedings in her cause, since the adjournment of the commissioners to Westminster. There they had examined her secretaries, who had repeated their former statements, and there, after mature deliberation, they had declared her guilty, and pronounced judgment of death against her; which judgment had since been confirmed by the Lords and Commons in parliament; who had petitioned that it might be immediately carried into execution, because they believed her to be "the seedplott, chief motive, and author of the "many forreine and home conspiracies against the "person, crowne, and state of the queen;" and that whilst she (Mary) was alive, there could be no security for "the queen's person, or the preservation of the "state of religion and commonwealth of the realm." In conclusion, she was told that, if she had any private communication to make it would be received by Buckhurst or Beale; and that, if she required spiritual assistance, the services of a bishop and a dean of the reformed church should be at her disposal. Nov. 19.

It had probably been expected that this announcement would tame the spirit of the Scottish queen,[1] but she had already nerved her mind for the shock, and

[1] On me menace, si je ne demande pardon; mais je dis: puisque jà ils m'ont destinée à mourir, qu'ils passent outre en leur injustice, esperant que Dieu m'en recompensera en l'autre monde.—Mary to Mendoza, Lettres, vi. 459.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

thanked them for the honesty of their avowal, that her death was the only security for their church. She had long known that she was to be sacrificed for that purpose. They might say that she had been privy to a conspiracy against the life of their queen. She utterly denied it. She had never contrived, nor imagined, nor commanded any such thing. She had, indeed, accepted an offer made to rescue her from prison; and where was the person in her situation who would not, after an unjust captivity of twenty years, have done the same? No! her real crime was her adhesion to the religion of her fathers, a crime of which she was proud, and for which she would be happy to lay down her life. With respect to any secret communication, she had but two requests to make to the English queen: 1. That her money and jewels might be restored to her, for the purpose of bequeathing them as legacies to her servants; and, 2. That she might be indulged with the attendance of a Catholic priest; for as she had always lived, so it was her resolution to die, a member of the Catholic church.[1]

Nov. 21.

On the second day after this, she received a visit from Paulet, who told her that, since she had made no use of the time that was granted to her, to confess and ask pardon, the queen had ordered her chair of state and canopy to be removed. She was a woman dead in law, and not entitled to the insignia of royalty. They were taken down by a party of his men. He then seated himself before her, face to face, put on his hat, and ordered her billiard-table to

[1] The instructions to Lord Buckhurst are in Lettres de Marie, vii. 210; the other particulars in Mary's own letters in vol. vi. 459, 464, 468, 470.

be carried away, saying that she ought to prepare herself for death, and could have no time to spend in idle amusements. She replied, that she had never played on it yet; for they had given her employment enough in other ways.[1] Mary was now occupied for some days in writing several important letters,—to Pope Sixtus V., to the duke of Guise, the archbishop of Glasgow, and Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador in Paris. Her servants, to supply the place of her canopy of state, had affixed to the wall a large cross bearing an image of Christ in the agony of death. This, in other circumstances, would have aroused the iconoclast zeal of Paulet; but the next time that he came into her presence, he was an altered and an humbled man. He had been severely rebuked by Elizabeth for his former rudeness to Mary. He came to apologize, saying, that he had mistaken an order from the council for an order from the queen,[2] and to inform Mary that her requests by Lord Buckhurst had been so far granted, that her money would be restored to her, and Préau, her almoner, would have the same freedom of waiting upon her as any of her other servants. She gladly availed herself of this concession, and confided to the care of Préau the letters which she had written. They all reached their destination.

Nov. 24.

The judgment of the commissioners had at length been proclaimed by sound of trumpet in London. The bells tolled for twenty-four hours; bonfires blazed in the streets; and the citizens appeared

Dec. 6.

[1] Mary to the archbishop of Glasgow, Lettres, vi. 470.

[2] Disant (Paulet et Drury) n'avoir fait cet acte par commandement de leur royne, mais par l'advis de quelques uns du conseil. Je leur ay mostré, au lieu de mes armes audit days, la croix de mon Sauveur.—Mary to the duke of Guise, Lettres, vi. 464.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. intoxicated with joy.[1] This intelligence awakened new alarms in the breast of the unfortunate queen. She knew that by the late statute her life lay at the mercy of every member of the association; she recollected the fate of the earl of Northumberland in the Tower; and she persuaded herself that it would be her lot to fall by the hand of an assassin. After many solicitations, she obtained permission to Dec. 19. make her last requests to Elizabeth. They were four: that her dead body might be conveyed to France, and deposited near that of her mother; that she might send a jewel, her farewell, and her blessing to her son; that her servants might be allowed to retain the small bequests which it was her intention to make them; and that she might not be put to death in private, otherwise her enemies would say of her, as they had said of others, that despair had induced her to shorten her days. Throughout the whole letter she carefully avoided every expression which might be interpreted as a petition for mercy. She thanked God that he had given her the courage to suffer injustice without murmuring; expressed her regret that her papers had not been honestly and entirely submitted to the inspection of Elizabeth, who would then have seen whether the safety of their sovereign was the real object of her adversaries; and, as she was about to leave this world, and was preparing herself for a better, hoped it would not be deemed presumption, if she reminded her good sister, that the day would come when she must render an account of her

[1] "The queen's majesty is contented to give order for the publi-
"cation of the proclamation; and it is hoped that she will be moved
"by their earnest instances to proceed thoroughly in this cause."—
Walsingham to Shrewsbury, December 2.

conduct to an unerring Judge, no less than those who had gone before her.[1] This noble letter, worthy of a queen and a martyr, was the last which Mary wrote to her English cousin. It drew tears from Elizabeth, but nothing more. No answer was returned.[2] CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

These extraordinary proceedings had attracted the notice, and excited the wonder of the neighbouring nations. All sovereigns felt a common interest in the fate of Mary; the kings of France and Scotland, as more nearly allied in blood, were more eager to rescue her from death. 1. Though Henry III. might hate the house of Guise, he could not see with indifference the head of a princess, who had worn the crown of France, fall beneath the axe of the executioner. But the weight of his interposition was lightened by the knowledge of his necessities; and the harshness of a direct refusal was eluded by fraud and cunning. At the request of Chasteauneuf, he had sent Bellievre with instructions to remonstrate in the most forcible and pointed language. The ambassador found unusual obstacles thrown in his way. He was first delayed under pretext that hired assassins, unknown to him, had insinuated themselves among his followers; and then an inquiry was ordered, whether the plague had not made its appearance in his household. In the meantime, the resolution of Nov. 20.

[1] "Ne m'accusez de presomption, si, abandonnant ce monde, et "me preparant pour un meilleur, je vous remonstre qu'un jour vous "aurez à respondre de votre charge aussi bien que ceux, qui y sont "envoyez les premiers." 19 Decembre. The whole letter is in Jebb, ii. 295.

[2] "There ys a letter from the Scottish queen, that hath wrought "tears; but I trust shall doe no further herein; albeit the delay "is too dangerous."—Leicester to Walsingham, Ellis, vol. iii. p. 22.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586 — Nov. 27.

parliament, that nothing short of the death of Mary could secure the life of Elizabeth, had been made public; and then Bellievre was introduced to the queen, seated on her throne, and surrounded by her officers of state. She listened to him with impatience; and replied in a long and studied harangue, but with a tone of asperity and flush of countenance which betrayed her inward emotion. She exaggerated the guilt of Mary, and claimed the praise of forbearance. She was, indeed, loath to shed the blood of one so nearly allied to her; but she knew not how to refuse the just prayer of her people. He must, therefore, be content to wait a day or two, and he should receive her final determination. For more than a month Bellievre attended at court; but all his applications were fruitless; and, when every other excuse had been exhausted, he was told that the queen would send an answer by a messenger of her own.[1] After

[1] See a very interesting account from the Régistre de depêches de M. de Villeroy, sécrétaire d'état, published in the Life of Lord Egerton, pp. 6, 7. When Bellievre told her that the king would resent the execution of Mary, she asked, "Sir, have you authority "from your sovereign to employ such language?" "Yes, madam, "he has expressly commanded me to use it." "Is your authority "signed with his own hand?" "It is, madam." "Then I re- "quire you to testify as much in your writing." This he did, p. 7; and Elizabeth wrote to the king a letter so characteristic of that lofty spirit which she occasionally assumed, that I may be allowed to copy some part of it. "Monsieur de Bellievre mà faict entendre "une language, que je ne puis trop bien interpreter. Car, pour "vous en ressentir, que je me sauve la vye, me semble une menasse "d'ennemy, que je le vous prometz, ne me fera jamais craindre; "ains, est le plus court chemin, pour depecher la cause de tant "de malheurs. . . . Laissez moi, je vous prie, entendre en quel "terme je prendray ces motz. Car je ne vivray heure que prince "quelconque se puisse vanter de tant d'humilité mienne, que je "boive, a mon déshonneur un tel traict. . . . Je ne suis naye "de si bas lieu, ni gouverne si petitz royalmes, que, en droict et "honneur je cederay a prince vivant que m'injurera; et ne doubte "par la grace de dieu, que ne face ma partie assez forte, pour me "conserver."—Egerton, quarto, 98.

his departure, L'Aubespine, the resident ambassador resumed the negotiation; but was silenced by a low and unworthy artifice. An uncertain rumour had been spread of a new plot to assassinate the queen, which had been traced to the French embassy. The ministers assured L'Aubespine that they believed him incapable of the crime; but they imprisoned his secretary, examined witnesses, and produced documents in proof of the plot. The Frenchman remonstrated in haughty and offensive language; all official communication between the two courts was suspended; and five despatches from the ambassador were at different times intercepted, and opened in presence of the council. The object of this quarrel, on the part of the English ministers, was to prevent any further application in favour of the queen of Scots. Henry, to show that he felt the insult, laid an embargo on the English shipping, and refused audience to the English ambassador. Still his anxiety to save the life of Mary subdued his pride. He condescended to despatch another envoy with new credentials. But these efforts were useless; Elizabeth had no leisure to admit him till Mary had perished; then apologies were made; the innocence of L'Aubespine was acknowledged; and both the king and the ambassador were loaded with praise and compliments.[1]

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

Jan. 3.

Jan. 8.

2. James of Scotland felt little for a mother whom he had never known, and whom he had been taught to

[1] Camd. 520. Murdin, 578—583. Jebb, 324. In Villeroy's Régistre in Egerton, is this remark on the papers produced: "Avoient "ces beaux conseillers d'Angleterre forgé, falsifié et composé toutes "telles escritures qu'ils avoient voullu sur ce faict par eux inventé "et projetté. Car il faut notter que jamais ne produisent les "mesmes *pieces originaulx des procedures, mais seulement des copies*, "esquelles ils ajoutent, ou diminuent ce qu'il leur plait."—Egerton, 101.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586.

look upon as an enemy, seeking to deprive him of his authority. He would probably have abandoned her to her fate without a sigh, had he not been roused from his apathy by the admonition of the French court, that her execution would exclude him from the succession to the English throne; and by the remonstrances of the Scottish nobles, who could not brook the notion that a Scottish queen should perish on a scaffold. James had already written to Elizabeth and the chief of her counsellors, and had commissioned Archibald Douglas, the Scottish resident, to expostu-

Nov. 12.

late; he next sent Sir Robert Keith, a young man, without weight or experience, and a pensionary of the English court, to request that proceedings against his mother might be stayed, till he should be made acquainted with her offence; and, when he received for answer that such delay might prove dangerous

Dec. 10.

to the life of Elizabeth, he was prevailed upon to despatch two new envoys, the master of Gray and Sir Robert Melville, to employ entreaties and threats. They suggested that Mary's life should be spared, on condition that she resigned all her rights to her son; this would secure Elizabeth from the fear of a competitor, and the established church from the enmity of a Catholic successor. It was replied, that after her condemnation, Mary had no rights to resign. They protested, in their master's name, that he would be compelled, in honour, to revenge her death. The menace was received with the most marked contempt.[1]

[1] See Egerton, 81, 87, 96, 114; Gray's despatch, Robertson, ii. App. xiv.; Ellis, iii. 21. She would not understand their proposal. "So the earl of Leicester answered that our meaning was, that the "king should be put in his mother's place. Is it so, the queen "answered, then I put myself in a worse case than before; by God's "passion, that were to cut my own throat, and for a duchy, or an

There can be little doubt that James was sincere; but he employed men to negotiate in favour of his mother, who deemed her death necessary for their own safety. Gray publicly performed the duty entrusted to him; but, before he left Scotland, he had advised by letter the employment of poison, and now he privately whispered in the ear of Elizabeth, that "the dead "cannot bite." On his return James expressed his suspicions; but the favourite was able to persuade the king of his innocence, and to divert the royal vengeance from himself to his accomplice, Archibald Douglas.[1]

After the publication of the sentence, Elizabeth spent two months in a state of apparent irresolution; but that irresolution arose, not from any feeling of pity, but from her regard to her own reputation; and

"earldome to yourself, you, or such as you, would cause some of "your desperate knaves to kill me. No, by God, he shall never be "in that place."—Ibid. Stuart, another envoy, assures her that James had sent them merely to save appearances; and that, whatever he might pretend, he would be easily pacified with a present of dogs and deer.—Egerton, 116.

[1] See the despatches in Robertson, ii. App. xiii, xiv.; Nicolas's Davison, 67. The records of the treachery of Gray and Douglas are their own letters. "The necessity of all honest men's affairs "requires that she were out of the way."—September 8. Murdin, 568. "This is a hard matter to the king not to make any media-"tion for his mother; yet the matter is also hard for you and me, "although we might do her good; for I know, as God lives, it "shall be a staff to break our own heads. He has commanded you "to deal very instantly for her; but if matters might stand well "between the queen and our own sovereign, I care not if she were "out of the way."—Lodge, ii. 331. "By God, the matter is hard "to you and me both."—November 27. Murdin, 573. "Answer "ye to the queen there and all my honourable friends, that they "shall find me always constant, and that in my negotiation I shall "do nothing but for their contentment, reserving my duty to my "sovereign."—December 9. Lodge, ii. 335. "By God, I say "this far, if ever she (Elizabeth) knew me do wrong, it was for that "I entered further for her service than good reason permitted."—December 25. Murdin, 575.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1586. she was often heard to lament, that among the thousands who professed to be attached to her as their sovereign, not one would spare her the necessity of dipping her hands in the blood of a sister queen. Preparatory to the execution, a precept had been directed to certain members of the association; in its place was substituted a warrant, in the usual form, to the sheriff of Northampton;[1] and this was afterwards superseded by a commission to the earl of Shrewsbury, as earl marshal, with the earls of Kent, Derby, Cumberland, and Pembroke as his assistants. The last met with the queen's approbation; but remained, apparently unnoticed, for six weeks in the custody of Davison, lately appointed one of her secretaries. After the departure of the French and Scottish ambassadors, she signed it, telling Davison to take it to the great seal, and to "trouble her no more with it;" adding, with a smile of irony, that on his way he might call on Walsingham, who was sick, and who, she feared, "at the sight of it would die outright." Then suddenly recollecting herself, she said, "Surely "Paulet and Drury" (the latter had been lately appointed additional keeper of Mary) "might ease me "of this burthen. Do you and Walsingham sound "their dispositions."

Dec. 10. Dec. 20. 1587. Feb. 1.

A letter was accordingly forwarded to Fotheringhay on the same day, in the name of both secretaries. It informed the two keepers, that the queen charged them with lack of care for her service, otherwise they would long ago have shortened the life of their captive. Of her guilt they could not doubt after her trial; and the oath of association which they had

[1] They are in Murdin, 574, 576.

taken would have cleared their consciences before God, their reputations before men. Paulet was a stern and unfeeling bigot. He hated Mary, because she was a Catholic; he sought her death, because he believed her the enemy of his religion. Yet he was an honest man, too intelligent to be the dupe of such sophistry, and too resolute to sacrifice his conscience to the will of his mistress. He replied immediately, that his goods, living, and life were at the queen's service; he was ready, if it pleased her, to forfeit them the next morning; but he would never make so foul a shipwreck of his conscience, or leave so great a blot on his posterity, as to shed blood without law or warrant. A postscript added that Drury "subscribed "in heart to Paulet's opinion."[1]

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587. Feb. 2.

Davison little suspected at the time, that he was destined to become the victim of Elizabeth's irresolution and dissimulation. The morning after the signature of the commission, he received an order from her, to wait, if it was not too late, till she had spoken to him; and when he informed her that the great seal was already appended to it, was asked by her with an air of surprise, why he had made "such haste;" to which he replied that on matters of consequence, it was not for him "to dally with her majesty's com- "mands." Her words and manner awakened in him

[1] Davison repeatedly requested that his letters might be burnt, "because they were not fit to be kept." Paulet replied, "If I "should say I have burnt the papers you wot of, I cannot tell if "anybody would believe me; and therefore I reserve them to be "delivered into your own hands at my coming to London."—February 8. He may have done so; but the letter and answer had previously been entered into his letter-book. Had this not happened, the fact would never have come to light. They have been often published.—See Hearne's Rob. of Gloucester, 673—676, and Howell's State Trials, i. 1241.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587. some misgivings. He consulted Hatton, and Hatton the lord treasurer, who, having ascertained that she had not positively recalled the commission, assembled the council. It was there resolved unanimously, that the queen had done all that the law required on her part; that to trouble her further was needless, dangerous, and offensive to her feelings; and that it was now their duty to proceed, and take the rest of the burthen on themselves.

On the following morning Elizabeth acquainted Davison that, in a dream during the night, she had
Feb. 3. punished him severely as the cause of the Scottish queen's death. Though she said it with a smile, he was alarmed, suspecting that she began to waver; and therefore openly put the question to her, whether she intended to proceed to the execution of the commission or not. "Yea, by G—," was her reply, with more than usual vehemence, but she did not like the form; for it threw all the responsibility on herself. The same day arrived the answer already mentioned from Paulet and Drury; and Burghley wrote to the commissioners a short letter, which was signed by each of the councillors. With it and the commission itself, Beale, clerk of the council, hastened to Fotheringhay.[1]

Feb. 4. In the course of the next day the queen inquired of Davison, what answer had been returned by Paulet and Drury. When he had informed her, she burst into expressions of anger and disappointment. Mary's keeper was no longer "her dear and faithful Paulet," but "a precise and dainty fellow," who scrupled not to break his oath, that he might throw the blame

[1] In Davison's apology the letter to the commissioners is said to have been written on the 2nd, but it bears the date of the 3rd.

upon her. Davison ventured to say that, if he had put Mary to death without warrant, she would have to avow or to avenge the deed. If she avowed it, the disgrace would be hers; if she avenged it, she would ruin the servants who had obeyed her orders. But she abruptly withdrew into her closet, and did not again mention the subject for some days. Had she then forgotten the fatal warrant? No; for, if we may believe Davison, on the very morning of Mary's death she expressed to him her surprise that it had not yet been executed.[1] CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

At Fotheringhay the frequent arrival of strangers had of late excited misgivings and apprehensions among the servants of Mary. On the seventh of February, the earl of Shrewsbury was announced; and his office of earl marshal instantly disclosed the fatal object of his visit. The queen rose from her bed, dressed, and seated herself by a small table, having previously arranged her servants, male and female, on each side. The earl entered uncovered; he was followed by the earl of Kent, the sheriff, and several gentlemen of the county; and Beale, after a short preface, read aloud the commission for the execution. Mary listened, without any change of countenance; then, crossing herself, she bade them welcome; the day, she said, which she had long desired, had at last arrived; she had languished in prison near twenty years, useless to others, and a Feb. 7.

[1] For all these particulars, see Davison's answers to the commissioners in Strype, iii. 375; his apologies in Robertson, ii. App. xix.; and Whitaker, iii. 544. Also Camden, 545; Somers's Tracts, i. 224; State Trials, 1229—1250. If I can understand Burghley's short notes in Strype, iii. App. 142, Leicester informed the council that it was the queen's pleasure that they should proceed; but at the same time should conceal the particulars from her.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

burden to herself; nor could she conceive a termination to such a life more happy, or more honourable, than to shed her blood for her religion. She next enumerated the wrongs which she had suffered, the offers which she had made, and the artifices and frauds employed by her enemies; and, in conclusion, placing her hand on a Testament which lay on the table, "As for the death of the queen your sove-"reign," said she, "I call God to witness, that I never "imagined it, never sought it, nor ever consented to "it."

"That book," exclaimed the earl of Kent, "is a "popish Testament, and of course the oath is of no "value." "It is a Catholic Testament," rejoined the queen; "on that account I prize it the more; and "therefore, according to your own reasoning, you "ought to judge my oath the more satisfactory." The earl, in return, exhorted her to abandon all papistical superstition, to save her soul by embracing the true faith, and to accept the spiritual services of the dean of Peterborough, a learned divine, appointed by the queen. But Mary replied, that she was, perhaps, better versed in controversy than he thought; she had read much, and had attended to the most learned of the reformed preachers; but had never met with any argument which should induce her to leave the faith of her fathers. Wherefore, in place of the dean of Peterborough, whom she would not hear, she requested that she might have the aid of Le Préau, her almoner, who was still in the house. This was the last and only indulgence which she had to demand.

It was answered, that her request could not be granted. It was contrary to the law of God, and the

law of the land; and would endanger the safety both of the souls and bodies of the commissioners. A long and desultory conversation followed. Mary asked if her son had forgotten his mother in her distress; whether none of the foreign powers had interceded in her favour; and lastly, when she was to suffer. To this question the earl of Shrewsbury answered, but with considerable agitation, "To-morrow morning at "eight o'clock."

The earls had risen, when the queen inquired what was become of her two secretaries; and, not receiving a satisfactory answer, asked, with much earnestness, whether Nau were dead or alive. Drury replied that he was still in prison. "What!" she exclaimed, "is "my life to be taken, and Nau's life spared? I pro- "test before God," putting her hand again on the book, "that Nau is the author of my death. He has "brought me to the scaffold, to save his own life. I "die in the place of Nau. But the truth will soon be "known."[1]

[1] "Quoy, je mourray, et Nau ne mourra pas! Je proteste," mettant la main sur le livre, "que Nau est cause de ma mort. Nau "me faict mourir pour se sauver. Je meurs pour Nau."—Jebb, ii. 621. Nor is it surprising that, in her ignorance of the real proceedings, she should think so. Yet she would not condemn him unheard, and therefore in her will bequeathed to him his wages, pension, and a large sum of money, if he prove that he has fulfilled certain conditions well known to her servants.—Goodall, i. 413, 414. Nau afterwards vindicated himself. Of Curle it is but fair that I relate the testimony given by Henry Clifford, the biographer of the duchess of Feria. "I was present at his death, when a little be- "fore calling F. Creswell, and the gentlemen, and men of anie "fashion, both English and Scots, he there protested, upon hope of "his salvation, of his fidelitie and true loyaltie, ever to the queene "his mistresse, both living and dead, against the calumnies and im- "putations putt in print, the authors being too lightly credulous. "And this he spake (myself being a witness) with great asseve- "ration, protesting his innocence even at the last gaspe, as he "should answer it before the tribunal of the eternal Judge. This "I hold myself bound in conscience to write, for that he desired

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

Mary had heard the denunciation of her death with a serenity of countenance, and dignity of manner, which awed and affected the beholders. The moment the earls were departed, her attendants burst into tears and lamentations: but she imposed silence, saying, "This is not a time to weep but to rejoice. "In a few hours you will see the end of my misfor- "tunes. My enemies may now say what they please; "but the earl of Kent has betrayed the secret, that "my religion is the real cause of my death. Be then "resigned, and leave me to my devotions."

After long and fervent prayer the queen was called to supper. She ate sparingly; and before she rose from table, drank to all her servants, who pledged her in return on their knees, and prayed her to pardon the faults which they had committed in her service. She forgave them cheerfully, asking at the same time forgiveness of them, if she had ever spoken or acted towards them unkindly, and concluded with a few words of advice for their future conduct in life. Even in this short address, she again mentioned her conviction that Nau was the author of her death.

This important night, the last of Mary's life, she divided into three parts. The arrangement of her domestic affairs, the writing of her will, and of three letters,—to her confessor, her cousin of Guise, and the king of France, occupied the first and longer portion.[1] The second she gave to exercises of devotion. In the

'all the assistants to witness what he affirmed on his death-bed" (p. 206).

[1] Her letter to her confessor is in Jebb, ii. 303; and Keralio, v. 433. She complains of the cruelty of her enemies in refusing her his aid, and begs of him to pray with her during the night. In that to the king of France, she says that she dies innocent of any crime against Elizabeth.—Jebb, ii. 303, 629.

retirement of her closet with her two maids, Jane Kennedy and Elspeth Curle, she prayed and read alternately; and sought for support and consolation in the lecture of the passion of Christ, and of a sermon on the death of the penitent thief. About four she retired to rest; but it was observed that she did not sleep. Her lips were in constant motion, and her mind seemed absorbed in prayer. CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

At the first break of day her household assembled around her. She read to them her will, distributed among them her clothes and money, and bade them adieu, kissing the women, and giving her hand to kiss to the men. Weeping, they followed her into her oratory, where she took her place in front of the altar; they knelt down and prayed behind her.[1] Feb. 8.

In the midst of the great hall of the castle had been raised a scaffold, covered with black serge, and surrounded with a low railing. About seven the doors were thrown open; the gentlemen of the county, who had been summoned by the sheriff, but without any notice of the object for which their attendance was required, immediately entered; and Paulet's guard augmented the number to between one hundred and fifty and two hundred spectators. Before eight a message was sent to the queen, who replied that she would be ready in half an hour. At that time, Andrews, the sheriff, entered the oratory, and Mary arose, taking the crucifix from the altar in her right, and carrying her prayer-book in her left hand. Her servants were forbidden to follow, they insisted; but the queen bade them to be content, and

[1] Conn, in his Life of Mary, says that she now administered the sacrament to herself in virtue of an indult from Pius V.—Jebb, ii. 45. This, from her letter to the pontiff, is plainly a mistake.

CHAP. XI. A.D. 1587. turning, gave them her blessing. They received it on their knees, some kissing her hands, others her mantle. The door closed; and the burst of lamentation from those within resounded through the hall.

Mary was now joined by the earls and her keepers, and descending the staircase, found at the foot Melville, the steward of her household, who for several weeks had been excluded from her presence. This old and faithful servant threw herself on his knees, and wringing his hands exclaimed, "Ah, madam, "unhappy me! was ever a man on earth the bearer "of such sorrow as I shall be, when I report that my "good and gracious queen and mistress was beheaded "in England?" Here his grief impeded his utterance; and Mary replied: "Good Melville, cease to "lament; thou hast rather cause to joy than mourn; "for thou shalt see the end of Mary Stuart's troubles. "Know that this world is but vanity, subject to more "sorrow than an ocean of tears can bewail. But I pray "thee, report that I die a true woman to my religion, "to Scotland, and to France. May God forgive them "that have long thirsted for my blood; as the hart "doth for the brooks of water. O God, thou art the "author of truth, and truth itself. Thou knowest "the inward chambers of my thoughts; and that I "always wished the union of England and Scot-"land. Commend me to my son; and tell him that "I have done nothing prejudicial to the dignity or "independence of his crown, or favourable to the "pretended superiority of our enemies." Then bursting into tears, she said, "Good Melville, farewell," and kissing him, "once again, good Melville, farewell, "and pray for thy mistress and queen." It was remarked as something extraordinary, that this was the

first time in her life that she had ever been known to address a person with the pronoun "thou."

Drying up her tears, she turned from Melville, and made her last request, that her servants might be present at her death.[1] But the earl of Kent objected that they would be troublesome by their grief and lamentations, might practise some superstitious trumpery, perhaps might dip their handkerchiefs in her grace's blood. "My lords," said Mary, "I will give "my word for them. They shall deserve no blame. "Certainly your mistress, being a maiden queen, will "vouchsafe, in regard of womanhood, that I have "some of my own women about me at my death." Receiving no answer, she continued, "You might, "I think, grant me a far greater courtesy, were I a "woman of lesser calling than the queen of Scots." Still they were silent; when she asked with vehemence, "Am I not the cousin to your queen, a descendant of "the blood royal of Henry VII., a married queen of "France, and the anointed queen of Scotland?" At these words the fanaticism of the earl of Kent began to yield; and it was resolved to admit four of her men and two of her women servants. She selected her steward, physician, apothecary, and surgeon, with her maids Kennedy and Curle.

The procession now set forward. It was headed by the sheriff and his officers; next followed Paulet and Drury, and the earls of Shrewsbury and Kent; and, lastly, came the Scottish queen, with Melville bearing her train. She wore the richest of her dresses, that

[1] The earl of Kent and Beale, in their account sent to the lords of the council, add: "Then shee demaunded to speake with her "priest, which was denyed unto her, the rather for that she came "with a superstityous payre of beades and a crucifix."—Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 113.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587. which was appropriate to the rank of a queen dowager.[1] Her step was firm, and her countenance cheerful. She bore without shrinking the gaze of the spectators and the sight of the scaffold, the block, and the executioner; and advanced into the hall with that grace and majesty, which she had so often displayed in her happier days, and in the palace of her fathers. To aid her, as she mounted the scaffold, Paulet offered his arm. "I thank you, Sir," said Mary; "it is the "last trouble I shall give you, and the most acceptable "service you have ever rendered me."

The queen seated herself on a stool which was prepared for her. On her right stood the two earls, on the left the sheriff and Beale, the clerk of the council, in front the executioner from the Tower, in a suit of black velvet, with his assistant also clad in black.[2] The warrant was read, and Mary in an audible voice addressed the assembly. She would have them recollect, also, that she was a sovereign princess, not subject to the parliament of England, but brought there to suffer by injustice and violence. She, however, thanked her God that he had given her this opportunity of publicly professing her religion, and of declaring, as she had often before declared, that she

[1] It is thus described: Her head-dress was of fine lawn, edged with bone lace, with a veil of the same, thrown back and reaching to the ground. She wore a mantle of black printed satin, lined with black taffeta and faced with sables, with a long train, and sleeves hanging to the ground. The buttons were of jet in the form of acorns, and set round with pearls: the collar à l'Italienne. Her purpoint was of black figured satin, and under it a bodice, unlaced on the back, of crimson satin, with the skirt of crimson velvet. A pomander chain with a cross of gold was suspended from her neck, a pair of beads from her waist. The executioner claimed all these articles as his right, but was compelled to surrender them for a sum of money.

[2] Egerton, 8.

had never imagined, nor compassed, nor consented to, the death of the English queen, nor ever sought the least harm to her person. After her death many things, which were then buried in darkness, would come to light. But she pardoned from her heart all her enemies, nor should her tongue utter that which might turn to their prejudice. Here she was interrupted by Dr. Fletcher, dean of Peterborough, who, having caught her eye, began to preach, and under the cover, perhaps through motives, of zeal contrived to insult the feelings of the unfortunate sufferer. He told her that his mistress, though compelled to execute justice on her body, was careful of the welfare of her soul; that she had sent him to bring her to the true fold of Christ, out of the communion of that church, in which, if she remained, she must be damned; that she might yet find mercy before God, if she would repent of her wickedness, acknowledge the justice of her punishment, and profess her gratitude for the favours which she had received from Elizabeth. Mary repeatedly desired him not to trouble himself and her. He persisted; she turned aside. He made the circuit of the scaffold, and again addressed her in front. An end was put to this extraordinary scene by the earl of Shrewsbury, who ordered him to pray. His prayer was the echo of his sermon; but Mary heard him not. She was employed at the time in her devotions, repeating with a loud voice, and in the Latin language, passages from the book of Psalms;[1] and, after the dean was reduced to silence, a prayer in French, in which she begged of God to pardon her sins, declared that she forgave her enemies, and protested that she

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

[1] These passages were from Psalms 31, 51, 91, as they are numbered in the reformed bibles.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

was innocent of ever consenting in wish or deed to the death of her English sister.[1] She then prayed in English for Christ's afflicted church, for her son James, and for Queen Elizabeth, and in conclusion, holding up the crucifix, exclaimed, "As thy arms, O God, were "stretched out upon the cross, so receive me into the "arms of thy mercy, and forgive me my sins." "Madam," said the earl of Kent, "you had better "leave such popish trumperies, and bear him in your "heart." She replied, "I cannot hold in my hand "the representation of his sufferings, but I must at "the same time bear him in my heart."

When her maids, bathed in tears, began to disrobe their mistress, the executioners, fearing the loss of their usual perquisites, hastily interfered. The queen remonstrated; but instantly submitted to their rudeness, observing to the earls, with a smile, that she was not accustomed to employ such grooms, or to undress in the presence of so numerous a company. Her servants, at the sight of their sovereign in this lamentable state, could not suppress their feelings; but

[1] Her protestation was as follows: "Permectez-moy, mon Dieu, "que, pour ma justification, je dye encores, sans vous offencer, et "informe en peu de parolles, tous ceulx en presence desquelz je "vous rends mon esprit, le reste du royaume, et toute la Chres- "tiente, de la protestation que je faictz, qui est que je n'ai oncques "consenty, voullu, conspiré, ny en aulcune sorte donné conseil, ny "aide, en touttes les conspirations de mort, pour lesquelles je suis "ici si faulcement accusée, et si inhumainement traictée." She then acknowledges that she had sought to procure her liberty by every means in her power, "sans néantmoings offencer votre "majesté divine, et l'estat de ce royaulme, et si j'aye eu aultre "intention en cest endroict, je luy supplye, que mon ame soit "perpetuelment privée de la participation de votre miserecorde et "grace, et du fruict qu'elle espere et attend de la mort et passion "de votre tres cher fils."—Egerton, quarto, 111. This prayer is in the account sent to the French court. I do not observe it mentioned in any other. But in England, perhaps, it would have been dangerous to do so.

Mary, putting her finger to her lips, commanded silence, gave them her blessing, and solicited their prayers. She then seated herself again. Kennedy, taking from her a handkerchief edged with gold, pinned it over her eyes; the executioners, holding her by the arms, led her to the block; and the queen kneeling down, said repeatedly, with a firm voice, "Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit." But the sobs and groans of the spectators disconcerted the headsman. He trembled, missed his aim, and inflicted a deep wound in the lower part of the skull. The queen remained motionless; and at the third stroke her head was severed from her body. When the executioner held it up, the muscles of the face were so strongly convulsed, that the features could not be recognized. He cried as usual, "God save "Queen Elizabeth."

"So perish all her enemies!" subjoined the dean of Peterborough.

"So perish all the enemies of the gospel!" exclaimed, in a still louder tone, the fanatical earl of Kent.

Not a voice was heard to cry amen. Party feeling was absorbed in admiration and pity.[1]

[1] We have several interesting accounts of the execution of the Scottish queen by eye-witnesses; one, the official despatch, by the earl of Shrewsbury, in Robertson (ii. App. xviii.); a second by R. W. for Lord Burghley, frequently published; a third still more circumstantial, by a servant of the Scottish queen, in Jebb (ii. 611, 641); a fourth by L'Aubespine in a letter to the king of France (Bethune MSS. 8808, fol. 7), and a fifth containing her prayer already mentioned. The body was embalmed the same day, in the presence of Paulet and the sheriff, by a physician from Stamford, and the surgeon of the village. It was afterwards enclosed in lead, and kept in the same room for six months, till the first of August, when Elizabeth ordered it to be interred with royal pomp in the abbey church of Peterborough, opposite to the tomb of Catherine, queen of Henry VIII. The servants of Mary had during all this

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

Before the execution of Mary, Elizabeth had balanced between the fear of infamy and the gratification of revenge. The blow had now been struck; her revenge was gratified; and it became her object to escape the infamy, under the shelter of pretended ignorance. The reader will recollect that Davison, instead of despatching the warrant immediately after it had been signed, retained it till the following morning. Of this he had apprized the queen, but she was careful not to iterate the order; she even suffered six days to elapse without any second mention of the warrant to Davison. Early on the next morning the lord Talbot arrived with the official intelligence. Burghley communicated it to his colleagues of the privy council; joyful tidings to men who during so many years had thirsted in vain for the death of the queen of Scots; but he proposed that instead of imparting the fact to Elizabeth then, time should be allowed to open it to her cautiously and by degrees. To this singular proposal, so singular that it provokes a suspicion of collusion between the hoary statesman and his mistress, the lords consented. The queen took her usual airing; and after her return entertained herself in the company of Don Antonio, the pretender to the crown of Portugal. By noon the report was spread through the city; the bells announced from authority the important event; and the

Feb. 9.

time been confined close prisoners at Fotheringhay. They were now dismissed; and the natives of France repaired to London on their way to their own country, but were detained there during a fortnight, that Nau, who was sent before them, might have leisure, as was supposed, to tell the tale suggested by the secretary in the French court. After Mary's body had rested twenty-five years at Peterborough, it was transferred to Westminster by order of James, October 11, 1612.—See Jebb, ii. 641, 649—661; Hearne's Camden, clxx.—clxxv; Egerton, 131.

darkness of the night was illumined by innumerable bonfires. That evening one of the queen's ladies mentioned before her, as it were casually, the death of Mary Stuart. Elizabeth maintained an air of perfect indifference; but in the morning, sending for Hatton, expressed the most violent indignation, and indulged in threats of the most fearful vengeance against the men who had abused her confidence and usurped her authority by putting the queen of Scots to death without her knowledge or consent. Hatton acquainted his colleagues of the council with the queen's threats; they sent for Davison, and advised him to keep out of her sight till her wrath should have subsided. Had they not already conspired to make him their scape-goat? He repaired to his own house under pretence of indisposition; but on the Tuesday the lord Buckhurst conducted him a prisoner to the Tower,[1] and on Wednesday, Elizabeth, sending for Roger, groom of the chamber to the French king, desired him to assure his sovereign of her regret for the death of the Scottish queen, of her ignorance of the despatch of the warrant, and of her resolution to punish the presumption of her ministers. To account

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

Feb. 11.

Feb. 14.

[1] Buckhurst had presented a memorial to the queen, in which he maintained that the committal of Davison would give rise to reports that the queen of Scots was in reality murdered; that the lords of the council would be thought murderers; that "the whole pro-"ceedings, even from the first to the last, would be measured by "the end, and esteemed no better than an unlawful course tending "unto murder;" that "the contempt and error of the secretary "would not be believed, or if it were, would not make the danger "less;" that the council, "having this warrant under her hand "and seal shown to them, were bound in duty and allegiance even "with all speed to cause the same to be executed;" and that "the "fact of the secretary, though it could not be excused, yet as the "cause stood, without dangerous inconveniences it might not be "punished."—In MS. Life of George, second earl of Shrewsbury, p. 199.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

for so late a communication, he was told that the council had concealed the death of Mary from the queen, who first learned that event from accidental conversation with a lady of the court.[1]

Elizabeth now attempted to prove the sincerity of her regret by the execution of her threats. She suspended the obnoxious ministers from their offices, and ordered them to answer in the Star-chamber for their contempt of her authority. But her anger was gradually appeased. In all humility they acknowledged their offence, pleaded the loyalty of their intentions, and submitted to her pleasure. One after another, all, with the exception of Davison, were restored to office and favour.[2] He had earned this

[1] See a very interesting letter from L'Aubespine to Henry III., dated February 27, N. S., in Egerton, 7–9; Camden, 539; and Davison's letter to Walsingham, February 20. The queen repeats the same assertion in a letter to Frederic II. king of Denmark, which was received in Copenhagen on the 23rd of March. "Hoc "diploma secretario cuidam nostro custodiendum dedimus, graviter "interdicentes ne cuiquam id enunciaret, aut quicquam in ea re "nobis non prius consultis ageret. Quod ille prorsus neglegens "(habita cum consiliariis nostris nonnullis consultatione) præcipiti "festinatione, nobis insciis, executioni mandavit, qui tamen nunc "ita se excusant, se esse veritos ne nimiâ nostrâ clementiâ nobis "ipsis exitium acceleraremus. . . . Ita præter nostram volun- "tatem, hujus secretarii temeritate regina illa (quanquam, quod "negari non potest, nonceutissima) nobis, Deum testamur, nihil "tale suspicantibus, morti tradita est. Secretarium tamen illum, "propter manifestum mandati nostri contemptum, in Turrim con- "jecimus, ut ad amussim tam inexpectati nobis facti rationem "reddat" (268). Yet Lord Willoughby, in a letter to the same prince, of the 4th of March, had attributed the death of Mary to the express command of the queen: "Non est novum, potentissime "rex, quod ante mensem regina clementissima, a sanguine tantum "abhorrens, ut justam ægre sumat vindictam, victa tamen omnium "Angliæ ordinum atque universitatis civium suorum et subditorum "precibus assiduis, eam jussit exequendam sententiam, quam regni "proceres tulerant, et tota gens nostra comprobat, contra nocen- "tissimam reginam."—New Danish Magazine, p. 267.

[2] We have several letters from Burghley to Elizabeth, during his temporary disgrace. Instead of vindicating himself, he submits to

distinction by his constant reluctance to unite with his colleagues in their persecution of Mary. He had declined to subscribe "the association," even at the request of the queen; he had eluded the task of examining Babington and his associates in the Tower; and did not afterwards, as other absent commissioners had done, sign the condemnation of the Scottish queen. To add to his demerits, in answer to the questions put to him in prison, he did not imitate the humility of his colleagues, but, in defending himself, charged the queen indirectly with falsehood, and alluded in obscure terms to her message to Paulet.[1] In court, however, he acted with more reserve than prudence. To the invectives of the crown lawyers he replied, that to acknowledge the offence would be to tarnish his own reputation, to contend with his sove-

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587. — March 12.

her will, and seeks to pacify her with texts of Scripture. In March he was called to the council to deliberate on the affairs of Holland; and the queen took the opportunity to charge him with his offence. Her violence was such that he hastened home, and wrote to her a most humble and desponding letter.—See Strype, iii. 371. App. 144—146.

[1] 1. In his examination, to the question, Did not her majesty give it in commandment to you to keep the warrant secret, and not utter it to any one? he answers, that she gave it to him without any such commandment, which he affirmeth as in the presence of God. 2. Did she command you to pass it to the great seal?—He answers affirmatively, and mentions such circumstances as he trusts will bring that commandment to her recollection. 3. Did she not, after it had passed the seal, command you, on your life, not to let it go out of your hand?—In answer he protesteth before God that he neither remembereth, nor received any such command. 4. Did she ever command you to deliver it to anybody?—As she did not expressly command him to deliver it, so did he never understand her meaning to be other than to have it proceeded in. 5. Did she not six or seven days afterwards tell you she had a better way to proceed therein?—He replies, "On the receipt of a letter from Mr. Paulet, "upon such cause *as she best knoweth*, she uttered such a speech as "that 'she could have matters otherwise done,' the particulars "whereof I leave to her best remembrance."—Strype, iii. 375.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

reign would be to transgress the duty of a subject; that they did him injustice by reading garbled passages from his answer; let them read the whole, or rather let them read none, for it contained secrets not fit for the public ear; he would only say, that he had acted under the persuasion that he was obeying the queen's commands, and for the rest would throw himself on her mercy. He was condemned in a fine of ten thousand marks, and to be imprisoned during the royal pleasure. The treasury seized all his property; so that, at his release from confinement in 1589, he found himself reduced to a state of extreme indigence. The queen, though she lived seventeen years longer, would never restore him to favour. He was still her secretary, but not allowed to exercise the office. She remained deaf to his repeated petitions to be admitted into her presence. Even the young earl of Essex, in the zenith of his influence, prayed for Davison in vain.[1] Perhaps she deemed him unworthy of pardon because he would not plead guilty; perhaps she thought by this severity to convince the world that she did not dissemble; certainly she effected one important object; she closed the mouth of her prisoner, whom the spirit of resentment, or the hope of vindicating his innocence, might have urged to reveal the secret history of the proceedings against Mary, and the unworthy artifices and guilty designs of his sovereign. He himself appears to have attributed the queen's severity to the

[1] Cabala, 229—232. Camden, 540—545. On this occasion Henry of France remarks to his ambassador that, after all the queen's pretences of anger against the counsellors, who, as she asserts, deceived her, Davison alone has been punished, and even his punishment, "n'a point été si rigoureuse, qu'ille puisse faire "changer ce que l'on a creu de l'execution de mort de ladicte dame "Royne."—Egerton, 127.

unfriendly offices of Burghley, who looked upon him as a rival in the way of his own son Robert.[1]

It may appear surprising, but a full month elapsed before the king of Scotland received any certain intelligence of the execution of his mother. At the news he burst into tears; he talked of nothing but vengeance; the people shared the resentment of the king, and the estates offered to risk their lives and fortunes in the national quarrel. Robert Carey, son to Lord Hunsdon, who arrived with a letter from Elizabeth, would have fallen a victim to the fury of the Scots, had not James sent him a guard for his protection.[2] The queen in her letter assured the young monarch that the death of Mary was not owing to her;[3] that the ministers, who ordered it without her knowledge, should be severely punished; that she would be to him in the place of his mother, whose condemnation should prove no prejudice to his rights and expectations. Elizabeth's partisans in the Scottish court supported her cause. They admonished James to recollect that he was now the next heir to the English crown; let him not forfeit that splendid inheritance by offending a princess who alone could remove him from it; nor rely on the uncertain friendship of the foreign powers, who, while they pretended

March 8.

[1] Nicolas's Davison, App. G.

[2] Carey's Memoirs, 13.

[3] The queen's letter was dated February 14: "I beseche you "that as God and many moe knowe how innocent I am in this case, "so you will believe me, that yf I had bid (directed) ought, I owld "have bid by yt (would abide by it). I am not so bace minded "that feare of any livinge creature or prince should make me "afrayde to do that were just, or don to denye the same. I am not "of so base a linage, nor cary so vile a minde. But, as not to "disguise, fits not a kinge, so will I never dissemble my actions, "but cawse them shewe even as I ment them."—The particulars he was to learn from the bearer.—Ellis, vol. iii. p. 23.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587.

to seek his honour, sought in reality nothing but their own interest. His indignation gradually evaporated; the cry of vengeance was subdued by the suggestions of prudence; and his mouth was sealed with a present of 4,000*l.*[1] Still the affront had sunk deep into the hearts of the Scots; and, at the conclusion of the parliament, the members besought the king on their knees to revenge the death of his mother. He replied that he felt as they did; that he was equally desirous of satisfaction, but that he must previously consult the princes his allies. Elizabeth had little to fear from him single-handed; but she reinforced her army on the marches, scattered gold with a liberal hand among the Scottish nobility, and, to alarm the monarch, sending for Arabella Stuart to court, exhibited her publicly as her intended successor. The resentment of James again evaporated; and it was thought that in reality he looked on the death of his mother as a personal benefit. It had relieved him from his fear of a rival for the Scottish throne.[2]

The revenge of Henry III. was equally harmless. A sense of honour had compelled him to forewarn Elizabeth that he should consider the execution of a queen dowager of France as an insult offered to the French crown. But, amidst the civil wars in which he was engaged, he was in no condition to execute this menace; nor could he, indeed, view with dissatisfaction an event which detracted something from the

[1] Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 124.

[2] Camden, 439, 446—450. Courcelles' Despatches, Cotton MSS. Cal. 1, ix. 233. Strype, iii. 377. Ellis, iii. 23. Egerton, 130, 131. Arabella was only twelve years old. "Voyez la bien," said the queen to Madame de Chasteauneuf, "elle sera quelque jour toute faicte "comme moi, et sera une maitresse dame. Mais j'auray esté "devant elle—Elle est fille de tres bel esprit, qui parle Latin, "Italien, et Francois fort bien."—Egerton, 132.

importance of the man whom he most hated, the duke of Guise. Now that the head of Mary had fallen, it became the object of the two powers to renew their former relations of amity. The chief obstacle arose from the pretended conspiracy to murder the queen, attributed to the French ambassador. Elizabeth was the first to yield. She assured L'Aubespine that she never gave any credit to the report; that she had always thought highly of his honour and integrity; and that his late behaviour had raised him still more in her esteem. After his audience with the queen, he was addressed in presence of the whole court, by the earl of Leicester and the rest of the cabinet in rotation, assuring him of their respect and friendship; of their sorrow for the late charge, of which they acknowledged him to be innocent; and of their desire that all cause of dissension might be buried in oblivion. With this farce (for so the ambassador calls it) ended the quarrel between the two crowns;[1] and the death

May 19.

[1] See a most interesting despatch from L'Aubespine, in Egerton, f. 9, 10. After a public apology to the ambassador, Elizabeth took him by the hand and led him into a corner of the room, where she told him that since their last interview the greatest of all calamities had befallen her in the death of the queen of Scots. Of that death she swore, with abundance of oaths, that she was innocent. She had determined never to execute the warrant, except in case of invasion or rebellion. Four of her council—they were then in the room—had played her a trick, which she should never forget. They had grown old in her service, and had acted from the best of motives, or by G— they should have lost their heads. But that which troubled her most was the displeasure of the king of France, whom she honoured above all men; whose interest she preferred to her own; and whom she was ready to supply with men, money, ships, and German mercenaries, against his enemies. L'Aubespine had previously resolved to make no remark on the death of Mary; but he took occasion of the last words to express a wish that the queen would show her esteem of his master by her deeds. To send men and ammunition to those who were in arms against him, to hire Germans to fight their battles, to capture French ships, and to treat a French ambassador for four months as she had treated him, were

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1587. of Mary was left unrevenged by those on whom that duty chiefly devolved—her son the king of Scotland, and her brother-in-law the king of France.

not convincing proofs of friendship and esteem. She replied, that she had done nothing against Henry, but had aided the king of Navarre against the duke of Guise. He asked whether to do even that without the consent of Henry, were not to do in a foreign realm what she would suffer no foreign prince to do in hers? He has not mentioned her answer, but adds that she talked incessantly for three hours.—Ibid.

CHAPTER VII.

MARITIME AND PIRATICAL EXPEDITIONS — HAWKINS — DRAKE — CAVENDISH — DISCONTENT OF THE HOLLANDERS — LOSS OF SLUYS — RETURN OF LEICESTER — HATTON MADE CHANCELLOR — PREPARATIONS OF PHILIP — OF ELIZABETH — THE ARMADA SAILS FROM LISBON — ENTERS THE CHANNEL — IS DISPERSED — AND COMPELLED TO RETURN BY THE NORTH OF SCOTLAND — MAGNANIMITY OF PHILIP — ELIZABETH VISITS THE ARMY AT TILBURY — LEICESTER DIES — HIS CHARACTER.

THAT spirit of commercial enterprise, which had been awakened under Mary, seemed to pervade and animate every description of men during the reign of Elizabeth. For the extension of trade, and the discovery of unknown lands, associations were formed, companies were incorporated, expeditions were planned; and the prospect of immense profit, which, though always anticipated, was seldom realized, seduced many to sacrifice their whole fortunes, prevailed even on the ministers, the nobility, and the queen herself, to risk considerable sums, in these hazardous undertakings. The agents of the Russia Company laboured to penetrate through Muscovy and Persia into Cathai; the Turkey merchants purchased and imported the productions of the Levant; English mariners explored, sometimes the coasts of Africa, sometimes those of America; and repeated attempts were made, in opposite directions, to force a passage to the East Indies, through the icebergs which crown

CHAP. VII.

the northern limits of the old and the new continents. The adventurers brought wealth and honour to their country. But among them there were many who, at a distance from home, and freed from the restraint of law, indulged in the most brutal excesses; whose rapacity despised the rights of nations and the claims of humanity; and whom, while we admire their skill, and hardihood, and perseverance, our more sober judgment must pronounce no better than public robbers and assassins.[1]

The renowned Sir John Hawkins first acquired
1562. celebrity by opening the trade in slaves. He made three voyages to the coast of Africa; bartered articles
1564. of trifling value for numerous lots of negroes; crossed the Atlantic to Hispaniola and the Spanish settlements in America; and in exchange for his captives returned with large quantities of hides, sugar, ginger, and pearls. This trade was, however, illicit; and
1567. during his third voyage to the bay of St. Juan d'Ulloa, Hawkins was surprised by the arrival of the Spanish viceroy with a fleet of twelve sail from Europe. The hostile squadrons viewed each other with jealousy and distrust; a doubtful truce was terminated by a general engagement; and in the end, though the Spaniards suffered severely, Hawkins lost his fleet, his treasure, and the majority of his followers. Out of six ships under his command, two only escaped; and of these one foundered at sea, the other, called the Judith, a bark of fifty tons, commanded by Francis Drake, brought back the remnant of the adventurers to Europe. The reader will perhaps be surprised when

[1] Hakluyt, passim. Stowe, 681, 684, 729. Camden, 243, 306, 332, 360, 449. Anderson, i. 420. Harris, i. 524—526, 575—583.

he understands that the two largest vessels out of the six engaged in this inhuman traffic belonged to the queen.[1] CHAP. VII. A.D. 1567.

In an age of religious fanaticism, it is not unusual to find habits of piety united with the indulgence of the most lawless passions. Drake attributed his late disaster to the perfidy of the viceroy. He thirsted for revenge; a naval chaplain was consulted; and the enlightened casuist determined, that the loss which he had suffered from a Spanish commander might be justly repaired by the plunder of Spanish subjects in any part of the globe. The conscience of the adventurer was satisfied; he made three predatory voyages to the West Indies; and if the two first were unsuccessful, the last amply indemnified him for his previous disappointments. In the Gulf of Mexico he captured more than one hundred small vessels; he took and plundered Nombre de Dios; made an expedition by land in the company of the Symerons, or fugitive 1572. May 24. July 28.

[1] Camden, 158. Stowe, 807. After this, Hawkins paid two more predatory visits to the Spanish settlements, and on his return sent his friend George Fitzwilliams to Madrid, with an offer of his services to the Spanish monarch. His sincerity was doubtful; but he tendered hostages for his fidelity; and on the 10th of August, 1571, an agreement was concluded and signed by the duke of Feria on the one part, and the messenger on the other, stating that, in order to restore the ancient religion, to put an end to the tyranny of Elizabeth, and to promote the right of Mary Stuart to the throne, Hawkins should bring with him into the service of Spain sixteen ships, the names of which were specified, carrying four hundred and twenty guns and one thousand five hundred and eighty-five men, and that Philip should grant to him and his an amnesty for past offences, and pay to him monthly sixteen thousand nine hundred and eighty-seven ducats for the charges of the fleet. The secret of this singular transaction was not so carefully kept as entirely to elude suspicion; Hawkins was summoned and examined by order of the council; but his exculpation was such that the lords were, or pretended to be, satisfied, and engaged him in the queen's service. The particulars are in Gonzalez, 116; Memorias, vii. 351, 360, 364, 367, 368.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1573. March 29. Oct. 1. negroes, and of a band of French adventurers; and intercepted a convoy of mules laden with gold and silver. This treasure satisfied his rapacity; to secure it, he hastened back to England, pretending that he had obtained it by way of barter from the natives.[1]

During his last expedition, from the summit of a mountain on the Isthmus of Darien, Drake had, for the first time, descried the great Pacific Ocean; and 1573. Feb. 11. in a transport of enthusiasm, falling on his knees, he called God to witness, that if life were granted him, he would one day unfurl the English flag on that sea, hitherto unknown to his countrymen. In England he was not unmindful of his vow. Walsingham, Hatton, and some of the other counsellors, applauded and aided his efforts; and Elizabeth herself staked a sum of one thousand crowns on the issue of the expedition. 1577. Nov. 15. With five ships and one hundred and sixty men he crossed the Atlantic to the coast of Brazil; passed the Straits of Magellan, and reached the small port 1578. Dec. 5. of Santiago on the Spanish main. No resistance had been prepared where no enemy had hitherto been known. From Santiago to Lima, the towns on the coast, and the vessels in the harbours, were taken 1579. March 1. and plundered. His last and richest capture was made at sea—the Cacafuego, a Spanish trader of considerable value. But the alarm was now raised; a squadron had been stationed at the straits to intercept his return; and Drake took the bold resolution of stretching across the Pacific Ocean to the Moluccas. Thence, after many dangers and adventures, doubling 1580. Nov. 3. the Cape of Good Hope, he returned to Plymouth in safety, after an absence of almost three years. His

[1] Camden, 352. Gonzalez, Mem. 373, 385.

arrival was celebrated as a triumph. He came indeed stained with bloodshed and rapine; but in the estimation of the people these blots were effaced by the glory of the enterprise; and England hailed with joy the return of her adventurous son, the first of mortals who had in one voyage circumnavigated the globe.[1] CHAP. VII. A.D. 1580.

Though Drake had sailed with five ships, he returned with only one,—the Golden Hind; but it was laden with treasure to the amount of eight hundred thousand pounds. Of this sum one-tenth was distributed among the officers and crew; a portion was given up to the Spanish ambassador, who claimed the whole in the name of his sovereign; and the rest, of which no account was ever received, was believed to have been shared among the queen, the commander, and the royal favourites. Four months, however, elapsed before she would give to Drake any public testimony of her approbation. His ship had been placed in the dock at Deptford, that it might be preserved as a memorial of his daring adventure. Elizabeth condescended to partake of a banquet which he gave in the cabin; and before her departure, conferred on him the honour of knighthood.[2] 1581. April 4.

When Philip complained of these depredations, they were feebly vindicated on the ground of his having secretly aided the queen's enemies, and sought to excite rebellion in her dominions. But if the plea of retaliation is to be admitted at all, we must seek out the original aggressor; and impartiality will compel us to lay the blame on the unjustifiable conduct of

[1] The glory of having practically demonstrated the orbicular form of the earth belonged to Majelhaen; but that navigator was prevented from completing his circumnavigation of the globe by his death in the Philippine Isles.

[2] Camden, 354—360. Stowe, 687. Harris, i. 19.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1581.

the English adventurers. At length, however, Elizabeth, as the ally of Holland, engaged in open war with Philip; the lawless pirate was immediately converted into an officer acting under the royal commission; and the skill and intrepidity of Drake were successfully employed in legitimate hostilities for the service of his sovereign. With a fleet of twenty-one sail he directed his course to the West Indies, burnt the town of St. Jago, plundered those of St. Domingo and Carthagena, and razed two Spanish forts on the coast of Florida.[1]

1585. Sept. 14.

At the same time, Thomas Cavendish, a gentleman of Suffolk, who had dissipated one-half of his property, sold the remainder, built or purchased three small vessels, and sailed in quest of adventures to the Spanish main. The inhabitants were upon their guard; and for several months his exploits were confined to the capture of a few coasting vessels and the conflagration of two or three villages. But just before his return, his good fortune led him into the course of the Santa Anna, a merchantman from the Manillas. The Spaniards repelled every attempt to board, but at last the sinking state of their ship compelled them to yield. The gold and silver, and more valuable commodities, were transferred from the prize to the English vessels; the other merchandise, amounting to five hundred tons, was consumed with the carrack; and the adventurer immediately returned by the Moluccas, Java, and the Cape of Good Hope. Like Drake, he had made the circuit of the globe;

1586. July 21.

1587. Nov. 4.

1588. Sept. 9.

[1] In this expedition he lost seven hundred men by sickness, and brought back to England the survivors of a colony, which Sir Walter Raleigh had sent out to Virginia. These colonists, on their return, introduced the custom of smoking tobacco.—Camden, 449. Harris, i. 815.

but like him he added little to the stock of general knowledge. The object of both was to enrich themselves at the expense of the Spaniards. This they effected; the improvement of science was beyond their abilities, or beneath their notice.[1]

These maritime expeditions might irritate the Spanish monarch; they contributed nothing towards the great object of the war. The subjugation or independence of the Netherlands was to be decided on the spot; and there Philip had little to dread, as long as the conduct of the hostile army was entrusted to the presumption and incapacity of Leicester. On his return to England in November, the earl had resumed his wonted ascendancy over the heart of the queen; instead of punishment, he met with reward; and, as if she sought to atone for the pain which she had given, she made him lord steward of her household, and chief justice in eyre south of the Trent. But during his absence, dissension and faction introduced themselves into the army in Holland. If many approved, many also condemned, the execution of the Scottish queen. Elizabeth was branded as the murderess of the rightful heir to the crown; and emissaries were artfully employed to debauch the fidelity of the soldiers. Among the officers was Sir Roland York, a soldier of fortune and captain of a fort near Zutphen, who, for some former offence, dreaded the secret resentment of Leicester. This man took the opportunity to insinuate to Sir William Stanley, governor of Daventer, that he, as the friend of Babington, and advocate of Mary, was an object of

1587. June 18.

[1] Stowe, 719. Camden, 552. Harris, i. 24. He afterwards undertook a similar voyage in 1591, and perished at sea.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

suspicion to the council, and was destined to suffer, at a convenient time, a similar fate. Stanley caught the alarm; he assembled the garrison, and declared that his conscience forbade him to fight in the cause of rebels against their sovereign; that Daventer belonged to the king of Spain; and that it was the duty of every honest man to restore to the right owner that property which had been unjustly acquired. They applauded his harangue. Both Daventer and the fort were surrendered; and Stanley and York, with thirteen hundred men, passed over to the service of Philip.[1]

This unexpected event spread terror and consternation throughout Belgium. The States assembled; and, as if the queen's lieutenant was no longer in existence, appointed Maurice, son to the late prince of Orange, stadtholder and captain-general in Holland, Zealand, and Friesland. But they soon had reason to repent of their precipitation. Leicester, by his religious cant, and his affectation of sanctity, had, during his residence in the Netherlands, formed a strong party

[1] Camden, 552. In justification of Stanley, a letter was published by Dr. Allen. I have not been able to procure it; but another apology by Persons may be seen in that writer's "Manifestation." He observes that Daventer had been surprised against the will of the inhabitants by Sir Wm. Stanley, who was sworn to keep it for the States, and with the garrison received pay from the States; that both Stanley and Leicester were enemies to Sir John Norris, who succeeded to the command on the departure of Leicester; and that on this account the latter left with Stanley a written license to quit the service at any moment he might think proper. Hence Persons contended that Stanley was no deserter, because he had the license to depart; that he was no traitor to Elizabeth, because he was in the pay of the States, and held the town for them; and that he was guilty of no injustice, because the town was the property of the king of Spain, and, as he had been instrumental in taking it from the right owner, he was bound in conscience to restore it to him.—Persons, Manifestation, p. 43—46.

among the reformed clergy. He frequented their sermons; he prayed and fasted in their company; he frequently received the sacrament; and on every occasion avowed a determination to extirpate popery, and to establish the gospel. They spread the shield of their influence over their absent disciple; and from their pulpits inveighed with bitterness against the ingratitude and the injustice of the States. Many towns disowned the authority of Maurice; the clergy of Friesland proclaimed Elizabeth their sovereign; and the synod of Sneck, in an address to the English ambassador, conjured the queen to hasten to the assistance of Christ, who put himself and his children under her protection. Elizabeth felt the affront offered to her favourite as offered to herself; and the lord Buckhurst was despatched to signify her displeasure. By his exertions harmony was restored. The appointment of the new stadtholder was declared to have been only provisional; Maurice expressed his readiness to resign the office whenever it should be required; and the fury of the people was appeased by a promise that Leicester should immediately return.[1] CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587. March 1.

The English queen, however, had a more important object in view. She had rashly, though reluctantly, plunged into the contest with Philip; she now sought to extricate herself from it with honour. Two foreign merchants, Grafigna, a Genoese in London, and De Loo, a Flamand in Antwerp, had been employed as representatives of the commercial interests in the two countries, to solicit, the one from Elizabeth, the other from Farnese, the restoration of peace. Both received favourable answers; through them a corre-

[1] Brandt, 409 Bentivoglio, ii. 99. Cabala, part ii. 1, 63.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

spondence was opened between Burghley and Sir James Croft, on the part of England, and Perrenotte and Richardot on that of Spain; and complimentary letters, expressive of the most pacific sentiments, were interchanged between Elizabeth and the duke.[1] In

Feb. 27.

the council the lord treasurer supported the views of his sovereign; but Leicester and his friends urged the continuation of the war. They foretold that, while the queen was deluded with a pretended negotiation, the Spanish squadrons would slip from their ports, unite in one numerous armament, and pour a foreign army on the English shores; and they wrought so powerfully on the fears and feelings of Elizabeth, that Drake was despatched from Plymouth to watch the harbours of Spain, and to oppose, if it were attempted,

April 2.

the junction of the Spanish fleet. But that officer had no intention to confine himself to the letter of his

April 19.

instructions. He hastened to Cadiz, bore fearlessly into the harbour, dispersed by his superior fire the Spanish galleys, and sunk, or burnt, or captured, or destroyed, no fewer than eighty sail, partly ships of war, partly merchantmen, either recently arrived from the East, or equipped to proceed to the West Indies. From Cadiz, the conquerors returned by the coast of Portugal; in the waters of the Tagus they insulted the marquess of Santa Crux, the admiral of Spain; and at sea their labours were rewarded by the capture of the St. Philip, a carrack of the largest dimensions, and laden with much valuable merchandise.[2]

The victorious admiral was received with gratitude by all but his sovereign. Elizabeth trembled, lest so great a loss should awaken in the breast of Philip the

[1] See their contents in Strada, l. ix. anno 1587.

[2] Drake's letter is in Strype, iii. 451; Stowe, 709.

desire of revenge, rather than of peace; and in answer to a letter from Farnese, who had offered to appoint negotiators, and left the place of meeting to the choice of the queen, she assured him that Drake had been sent out for the sole purpose of opposing any attempt at invasion; that orders had been forwarded to him to abstain from every act of hostility; and that, as he had disobeyed her commands, he should suffer for his presumption on his return. Farnese affected to be satisfied, but prepared to play a similar game. To Elizabeth he replied, that he could believe anything of a man who had been bred a pirate, and who at Cadiz had acted in the usual line of his profession; that he was still willing to abide by his former offer; and that it depended on the queen alone to put an end to the horrors of war.[1] But, while she was thus amused by his proposals, while she feared that a second act of hostility might extinguish every hope of pacification, the duke silently arranged his plans, and gave instructions to his officers. On a sudden, Sluys, a fort of the first consequence, garrisoned partly by Englishmen and partly by Hollanders, was besieged; and the number and discipline of the enemy, the abilities and good fortune of their leader, taught the States to tremble for its safety. They made the most pressing instances to the queen; her favourite assailed her with arguments and entreaties; still she hesitated; she wrote to Farnese to withdraw his forces; nor was it till she had received a refusal, that she gave her consent to the departure of Leicester. He took with him a large sum of money, and a reinforcement of five thousand men; but he was hampered with instructions which he could not, or would not, understand;

May 29.

June 23

[1] Strada, l. ix. anno 1558.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

he was ordered to sound, in the first instance, the disposition of the Hollanders; and, if he found them averse from peace, to declare that the queen would retire from the contest, unless they could advance one hundred thousand pounds for the payment of a more numerous army. The earl arrived, assembled his forces, and made three unsuccessful attempts to raise the siege. Sluys capitulated; and the royal message was delivered. The States received it with reproaches and complaints; and, in the transport of their indignation, indulged in the most unjust and alarming suspicions. They had been, they said, betrayed by placing confidence in the professions of their allies. Avarice had induced their pretended friend, the queen of England, to sell them to the king of Spain, and to stipulate the surrender of the places garrisoned by her troops, in return for a sum of money sufficient to defray the past expenses of the war. These charges, though unfounded and improbable, were circulated and believed; and the earl, from having been the idol, became in a few days the execration of the people.

July 30.

From the conflicting assertions of Leicester and his opponents, it is difficult to form a correct notion of his proceedings. *They* charged him with aspiring to the sovereignty of the provinces; they asserted, that with this view he had sought to place English governors in every fortress; had attempted to seize the persons of Barnevelt, his chief adversary, and of Prince Maurice, his most formidable rival; and had arranged a plot to seize for himself the city of Leyden, which was preserved to the States only by the timidity and flight of the conspirators.[1] Leicester, on the contrary, com-

[1] Camden, 555. Brandt, 414.

plained bitterly of the ingratitude of the Hollanders; accused the most ardent among the patriots of corruption and treason; and pretended that a secret design existed of betraying the Netherlands into the hands of Philip. However these things may be, his influence with Elizabeth, though supported by that of his son-in-law, the young earl of Essex, was apparently gone. She believed that he had neglected her instructions, and sought chiefly his own aggrandizement; and when Farnese complained that the queen had no real desire of peace, she laid the blame, first on the negligence, and then on the ambition of Leicester. He was recalled; and on his arrival, aware of his danger, threw himself at her feet, and conjured her to have pity on her former favourite. "She had sent him to the "Netherlands with honour; would she receive him "back in disgrace? She had raised him from the "dust; would she now bury him alive?" Elizabeth relented; but the result of the interview was not revealed till the following morning. The earl had received a summons to answer before the council. He obeyed; but, instead of kneeling at the foot of the table, took his accustomed seat; and when the secretary began to read the charges which had been prepared, he arose, inveighed against the baseness and perfidy of his calumniators, and appealed from the prejudices of his equals to the equity of his sovereign. The members gazed on each other; the secretary passed to the ordinary business of the day; and the lord Buckhurst, the accuser, was ordered to consider himself a prisoner in his own house. Such a punishment was evidently unjust. But he submitted without a murmur; and so rigorously did he observe the royal order, that, although his confinement lasted till

Nov. 21.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587. — the death of Leicester, he never admitted, during nine months, either his wife or children into his company.[1]

April 12. About the same time, the death of Bromley, lord chancellor, enabled the queen to satisfy the ambition of another of her favourites. Since the Reformation, that high office had been confined to lawyers; she now resolved to break through the custom, and to bestow April 18. it on the earl of Rutland. But Rutland died within a few days; and to the surprise and amusement of the April 29. public, Sir Christopher Hatton was appointed chancellor. There is much in the personal history of this fortunate courtier to instruct and interest the reader.[2] Above five and twenty years had elapsed since it chanced that the students in the inns of court gave a magnificent ball in honour of the queen. Among the maskers her eye distinguished one, who in stature, activity, and gracefulness of manner excelled all his compeers. The lucky dancer was Hatton, a young gentleman of slender fortune, from Northamptonshire. She invited him to court, gave him an appointment in her band of pensioners, and made him a gentleman of the privy chamber.[3] Years passed before he was

[1] Besides the historians of the period, consult the original letters in the Hardwicke Papers, i. 334—360. It would appear that Leicester had much to say in his own defence, but that the advocates of peace had obtained the ascendancy while the earl was absent in Holland, and Walsingham was confined to his house by sickness.

[2] The reader will see how much I am indebted for this sketch to "the Memoirs of Sir Christopher Hatton, his Life and Times," by Sir Harris Nicolas, who has cleared the biography of Hatton from many apocryphal anecdotes, and brought to light much new and interesting matter from Hatton's letter-book, and autograph letters.

[3] A gentleman of the privy chamber had a right of entry into her chamber, even to the exclusion of her ladies. Thus it is said of Stanhope, one of them, in a letter from Heneage, "Yesterday, all the "afternoon, Stanhope was drawn in to be with her in private, and "the ladies shut out of the privy chamber."—Nicolas, p. 278.

raised to any higher office, but these situations gave him frequent access to the queen, and it soon became manifest that he enjoyed a considerable portion of the royal favour. Niggard as the queen usually was to the most deserving of her servants, she seldom suffered a long interval to pass without making to Hatton some valuable grant in lands or rents; and it was observed that, at her annual new years' gifts, she constantly assigned to him a much more valuable present than to any other individual.[1] These marks of favour excited jealousy and suspicion; occasionally she could not forbear from lavishing caresses upon him in the presence of others; frequently she spent several hours at a time with him in private; the tongue of scandal was not idle; and it became the general belief that he occupied that place in her affection which had formerly been assigned to the earl of Leicester.[2] In 1572 she gave to him a fresh mark of her confidence by appointing him captain of the guard; the next year, on account of some dangerous internal disease, he was advised to drink the waters at the Spa; and the queen ordered Julio, her own physician, to attend him during his journey. He parted from her with manifest reluctance, perhaps through apprehension, that during his absence he might be supplanted by some fortunate rival. She wrote to him a consolatory note the next day; and his answers to that and to several other letters from

1573 June 3.

[1] It was customary for the courtiers to make some valuable present to the queen on the first day of the year. To each in return she sent a certain quantity of gilt plate. The average quantity was from forty to fifty ounces; but to Hatton, and to Hatton alone, four hundred ounces were always assigned.—Nicolas, p. 3.

[2] See Dyer's letter to Hatton in Davison's poetical rhapsody, p. lxxiii., and Nicolas's Hatton, p. 16.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1573.

her are still extant; answers written in a most extraordinary style, and breathing the passionate language of a favoured and presumptuous lover.[1] At the Spa his health improved rapidly; he returned and resumed

September

his former situation at court. In 1577 the queen conferred on him the honour of knighthood, appointed him vice-chamberlain, and gave to him a seat in the privy council; honour, not incompatible with the duties which his other offices required. After this period we learn little of him but from the occasional entries in his letter-book; from which it seems fair to infer that, when he was at court, the queen spent much time in his company, conversing with him confidentially on all manner of subjects, whether the gossip of the day, or matters of the gravest moment; and often employing him as a sort of amanuensis, to notify her pleasure to different individuals. This was to him occasionally a source of great annoyance. For he was sometimes compelled by her order to suspend or alter the decisions of the council, sometimes to reprehend the ministers or ambassadors for their conduct, and once at least, perhaps oftener, to interfere with the regular proceedings in courts of justice. Enjoying, however, such opportunities of influencing the sovereign, he could not be surprised to find himself beset with hosts of suitors, soliciting his aid and patronage; and though there cannot be a doubt that he was a party with his colleagues, Burghley, Leicester, and Walsingham, to many questionable and unjustifiable proceedings, yet to his honour it must be recorded that we find him at times employing his authority to shield the poor and friendless from oppression, and to

[1] They are in Nicolas, p. 22—30.

mitigate the severity of the law in favour of recusants under prosecution for their religion before the ecclesiastical commission.

Among the gallants at court was one, who from the first appears to have been an object of jealousy to Hatton,—the young and accomplished Walter Raleigh, the very counterpart of Hatton himself, when about twenty years before he entered on his fortunate career. In 1582 Raleigh received from the queen some distinguished mark of royal favour. Hatton was offended; and in proof of his displeasure he withdrew sullenly from court, and shut himself up in the country. Thus the gentle tarsel was flown; where was the falconer's voice to lure him back again? Elizabeth undertook that office, and performed it successfully, but by a process too mysterious and enigmatical to be readily understood. Messages were exchanged between her and the fugitive, and jewels transmitted for tokens, with the quaintest conceits, and nonsensical comments on the "Belwether" and "the Water," the sobriquets of the two rivals.[1] Hatton very wisely suffered himself to be persuaded,

[1] Originally the queen gave to Hatton the name of her "Mutton," which was afterwards changed into her "Belwether," probably because he was captain of the guard. Raleigh was called "Water," perhaps from his passion for maritime adventure and voyages of discovery. The queen read Hatton's letter with blushing cheeks, and told Heneage, who had delivered it, that she knew not whether to be angry or pleased; that if princes were like gods, they would suffer no *element* to breed confusion; that "pecora campi" were so dear to her, she would never permit "Water" or floods to overwhelm them; and to the end that her "Belwether" might not fear drowning, she would send to him for a token the bird (a dove), from which Noah learned that the "waters" had abated from the face of the earth. In conclusion, Heneage informed Hatton that, after all, "Water" had been much more welcome than was fit for the season, but he hoped that it would make neither himself nor his friend wet-shod. Hatton's tokens to the queen were a "bucket" to bale out the water, and a bodkin.—See the letter in Nicolas, p. 277.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

and resumed his former offices at court; but in 1585 he was seized with a second fit of jealousy; and the same game was played over again with a similar result. Still "Water" continued to encroach on the domain of the "Belwether." In 1580 Raleigh was made captain of the guard, the post which Hatton had so long possessed, lord warden of the Stannaries, and the queen's lieutenant in Cornwall; but in the next year she put an end to the contest between the two rivals. The elevation of Hatton to the chancellorship placed him at an immeasurable height above Raleigh. It might be to gratify *his* ambition, perhaps to free *herself* from the constant attendance of an old and querulous servant; but his possession of the great seal proved a sore disappointment to the lawyers, who seemed to look upon it as the property of their own body; and we are told that some of them objected to plead before a man who from his habits of life could not be qualified to act as a judge in equity. He was, however, less disqualified than may be supposed. For some years he had constantly attended in the Star-chamber, and often taken a prominent part in the judgments pronounced by that tribunal. In Chancery, to supply his deficiency in practical knowledge, he made an order that some of the masters should always sit with him; and in important and intricate cases was careful to seek the advice of men of acknowledged learning and integrity. We hear no complaints of the manner in which he administered justice; he has been commended for the splendour which he threw round his office of chief magistrate.[1]

We are now arrived at the most interesting and

[1] Splendidissime omnium quos vidimus, gessit.—Camden, 558

memorable epoch in the reign of Elizabeth. The reader must have noticed the injuries which the queen had almost annually offered to the king of Spain. She had intercepted his treasure, had given aid to his rebels, had hired foreign mercenaries to fight against his armies, and had suffered her mariners to plunder and massacre his defenceless subjects on the high seas and in his American dominions. Policy taught him to dissemble, he covered his feelings with an affectation of disdain; and the monarch so haughty to every other power, appeared to bear the provocations given by Elizabeth with the most stoical indifference. But the constant repetition of insult, the sophisms with which his complaints had formerly been answered, and the recollection that the queen, under the reign of her sister, had owed her liberty, perhaps her life, to his protection, sharpened the edge of his resentment;[1] and if he hesitated to strike, it was only that he might take more sure and ample vengeance. In 1583, after a forbearance of fifteen years, he flattered himself that the day of retribution was come. The duke of Anjou had been driven out of the Netherlands; France trembled on the verge of a civil war; and the defeat of his rival Don Antonio, with the reduction of Tercera, had secured on his head the crown of Portugal. Freed from other foes, he turned his attention to the English queen; but he was by nature slow and cautious: to arrange his plans, to make his preparations, demanded leisure and consideration; and five more years were suffered to elapse before the armada, designed to subjugate the English nation, was ready to sail from the ports of

[1] See Philopat. Augustæ, 1592, p. 68—83. Osborn's Memoirs, 13.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

Spain. During this interval the conduct of Elizabeth had not been calculated to avert his resentment. She had sent to the relief of the Belgian insurgents an English army, under a general who assumed the title and authority of governor of the revolted provinces; and after a trial unprecedented in the annals of Europe, she had taken, on a scaffold, the life of the queen of Scots. The first was equivalent to a declaration of war, which Philip could not refuse to notice without the imputation of cowardice; the second was an insult to the majesty of sovereigns, which, as the most powerful of Christian monarchs, he deemed it his duty to revenge.

Of all men, the Spanish king should have been the last to acknowledge in the pontiff the right of disposing of the crowns of princes. In former times he had not hesitated to declare war against Paul IV.; and, by his general the duke of Alva, had dictated the terms of peace in the Vatican. Revenge and ambition taught him a different lesson. In confidence he communicated his object to Sixtus V., the reigning pope, and solicited his co-operation in an attempt which had for one of its objects the restoration of the papal authority in England. For this purpose he demanded an aid in money, the renewal of the censures promulgated against Elizabeth by former pontiffs, and a grant of the purple for Dr. Allen, who, in the event of success, might proceed as legate to England, regulate the concerns of religion as had been done by Cardinal Pole, and confer on the conqueror the investiture of the kingdom.[1] Allen, ignorant of the project, was at the Spa, for the benefit of his health;

[1] The despatch is among the records at Simancas.

under some other pretext, he was drawn to Rome; and, though he declined the dignity, as he had before declined it under Gregory XIII., he was, against his will, created cardinal by the title of St. Martin in Montibus. But though Sixtus kept the secret locked up within his own breast, the motive of Allen's promotion was suspected by the politicians at the papal court; and the pontiff, apprehensive of the discovery, exhorted Philip to hasten the expedition, offering him a subsidy of a million of crowns, to be paid as soon as the invading army had landed on the coast of England.[1] CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587. August 7. N. S. Nov. 1.

The preparations of that monarch, both in Spain and the Netherlands, were proportionate to the importance of the undertaking. Never had the ocean borne a more gallant fleet than that which now rode in the harbours of Spain. One hundred and thirty-five sail of men-of-war, carrying eight thousand seamen and nineteen thousand soldiers, obeyed the command of the marquess of Santa Crux, an officer who had grown grey in the naval service, and whose brow was shaded with the laurels of numerous victories.[2] In Flanders, the forest of Waes had been felled; the dockyards of Antwerp, Newport, Gravelines, and Dunkirk swarmed with artificers; and the rivers and canals were covered with flat-bottomed boats, destined to serve as transports in the projected invasion. The

[1] Fitzherbert, Vita Alani, 87. Strada, l. ix. anno 1588. Maffei, Hist. ab excessu Gregor. XIII. p. 25.

[2] The vessels composing this fleet were of four kinds:—1. The ordinary ship of war, formed after the chiule or keel of the ancient northern nations. 2. The galley, which employed the aid of oars, and carried cannon on the prow and the stern. 3. The galeasse, one-third larger and broader than the galley, with the addition of cannon on each side, between every bench of oars. 4. The galleon, or large chiule, being the ordinary ship of war extended in length, with cannon on each flank, and powerful batteries on the prow and stern.—See Strada, l. ix. anno 1558.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

reputation of Farnese, and the danger but glory of the attempt, had drawn volunteers from many of the most noble families in Europe; on every road were met bodies of soldiers hastening from Spain, and Germany, and Italy, to the place of rendezvous; and when the duke of Parma had mustered his forces, and allotted to the count Mansfeldt eleven thousand men in addition to the ordinary garrisons for the defence of the country, he had still at his disposal thirty thousand infantry and eighteen hundred cavalry, to be employed in the invasion of England.[1]

It was impossible that these preparations could escape the notice of the English government; but Philip circulated different reports to cover their real destination. Elizabeth was plunged in the most cruel uncertainty where the storm would ultimately burst, whether on *her* head, or on the insurgents of Belgium. It was necessary that she should be on her guard; but parsimony inclined her to distrust both the advice of her ministers and the warnings of their spies; and she alternately quickened or retarded her preparations, as hope or fear preponderated in her mind. She easily consented that a military council for the defence of the kingdom should be established; that all the male population from the age of eighteen to that of sixty should be enrolled; and that the lords lieutenant should be instructed to form companies of militia, to appoint officers, and to provide arms at the expense of the counties. But to call these men into active service would entail a great expense on the crown. She still cherished a hope of avoiding the contest; and if at last two armies were ordered to assemble,

[1] Strada, ibid. Hardwicke Papers, i. 354. Camden, 563.

one of thirty-six thousand men, under Lord Hunsdon, for the defence of the royal person, and another of thirty thousand, under the earl of Leicester, for the protection of the capital, these measures were so long delayed, that the first existed nowhere but upon paper; the second never reached to more than one half of the specified number.[1] It was, however, of small moment. Such raw and hasty levies could have opposed but a feeble resistance to the numerous and disciplined force under the duke of Parma.[2] England was destined to be saved by the skill and intrepidity of her navy.

In the last autumn, a sense of danger had extorted from the queen a warrant for the levy of five thousand seamen; in January she repented of her prodigality, and ordered two thousand to be dismissed. As, however, the rumour of invasion assumed a more authenticated shape, she yielded to the entreaties of her council: the original number was again filled up; it

[1] The orders for the army under Leicester were issued in June. In what manner it was to be composed, may be seen in Murdin, 611. It was to consist of twenty-seven thousand infantry, four hundred and seven lancers, two thousand and eleven light horse, and eighteen pieces of artillery. Yet on the 10th of August it did not exceed fifteen thousand foot, with their complement of horse.—Stowe, 743. Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 142. Nor was it possible to procure arms for a greater number.—Molino's report to the senate of Venice (MS. Greystoke Castle). Now, if the armada had not been dispersed by the fireships and the storm, the attempt to land would have been made on the 30th or 31st of July. As for Lord Hunsdon's army, none except the men from London and Middlesex received orders to assemble before the 6th of August.—Murdin, 612, 613. Of this Leicester complained, on July 27. God had given the queen forces and power; yet she would not use them when she ought.—Hardwicke Papers, i. 576.

[2] See, in a note in the Hardwicke Papers, i. 575, the opinion which Sir John Smyth, an old soldier, who was employed to train the new levies, had formed of this army. He wrote a work on military discipline, which, on account of some such passages, was suppressed.—Strype, iv. 47.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

was even raised to seven thousand men.[1] The royal navy consisted of thirty-four men-of-war, of which five measured from eight to eleven hundred tons; the city of London furnished thirty-three, and private individuals eighteen sail; and to these, in such an emergency, were added forty-three hired ships, and fifty-three coasters. The chief command was assumed, in virtue of his office, by Lord Howard of Effingham, admiral of England, whose resolution and intrepidity were universally acknowledged, and whose want of naval experience was supplied by a council of able seamen. Under him served, as volunteers, the earl of Cumberland, and the lords Henry Seymour, Thomas Howard, and Edmund Sheffield; Drake was appointed lieutenant of the fleet; and the best ships were given to Hawkins, Frobisher, and other mariners, who, in voyages of commerce, or piracy, or discovery, had acquired experience, and displayed that contempt of danger and that spirit of enterprise, which had long been characteristic of the British sailor.[2]

The only neighbouring powers to whom the queen could apply for assistance were the states of Belgium and the king of Scots. The independence of the former was owing to her protection; their ruin must be the inevitable consequence of her subjugation. Interest and gratitude taught them to obey the call. They forgot all recent causes of offence, undertook to shut up the navigation of the Scheldt, and sent to the fleet a squadron of twenty sail. From the king of Scotland she dared not hope for active assistance; but to secure his neutrality was an object of immense importance. James appeared to waver; a Spanish

[1] The treasurer's accounts, in Murdin, 620.

[2] See the statement of the fleet in Murdin, 615—618.

party had been formed among his subjects; the addition of a Spanish army and of Spanish treasure would have roused him from his inactivity, and have made him the avenger of the blood of his mother. Such a measure was urged in the council of Philip;[1] but he distrusted the fidelity of the Scottish king, whose policy it was not to commit himself with either party till he should see the probable event of the contest. If, to please his Protestant subjects, he subscribed the Covenant and put down the attempt of the lord Maxwell on the borders; yet, at the same time, he listened with coldness to the apology offered by Lord Hunsdon for the death of Mary; put forth his own claims with a tone of authority; and held the English cabinet in suspense, till he had extorted the most magnificent promises from Ashby, the resident ambassador. Then, indeed, he forbade his subjects to aid the enemy, and offered to Elizabeth the whole force of his kingdom; but this was at a time when the armada had been already defeated, and the Spaniards were fleeing before their pursuers along the shores of Scotland.[2]

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

August 4.

[1] This advice was given by Plato, a celebrated engineer; and Leicester informs us, "that James had instruments about him, "labouring to have men sent him."—Murdin, 592. Again he observes: "Scotland is altogether neglected, from which all our "mischief is to come, where the employment of two thousand men "by the enemy, with some portion of treasure, may more annoy us "than thirty thousand landed in this realm."—Hardwicke Papers, i. 360.

[2] That James remained in suspense to the last, is evident from the dates. In the autumn Lord Hunsdon wrote to the queen, "that "if she looked for any amity or kindness at his hands, she would "find herself deceived."—Murdin, 591. In April, Hunsdon received instructions to satisfy him for his mother's death; in June, Mr. Ashby was sent to him; in July, Sir Robert Sydney went on a similar mission.—Cecil's Dairy. Murdin, 787, 788. They did not succeed. For on the 27th of July, Walsingham wrote to Douglas,

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

But there was within the realm a class of men whose doubtful loyalty created more alarm in the cabinet than the procrastination of the Scottish, or the enmity of the Spanish monarch. The real number of the English Catholics was unknown (for the severity of the penal laws had taught many to conceal their religion); but it was loosely conjectured that they amounted to at least one-half of the population of the kingdom.[1] Hitherto they had been the victims of a relentless persecution; was there not reason to expect that they would receive the Spaniards as deliverers? The queen had been deprived of all right to the throne by the head of their church; would they not avail themselves of that sentence to wrest from her hands the sceptre of iron with which she had ruled them? Under the influence of these fears, some of her advisers, as if the massacre of St. Bartholomew had furnished a useful precedent, suggested the putting to death of the leading men in the Catholic body; and, had they not been saved by the humanity of the queen herself, the chief of that party, the most distinguished by birth and property, would have been sacrificed to the jealousy of their adversaries. But Elizabeth rejected the barbarous advice; and, as no trace of any disloyal project could be discovered, refused to dip her hands in innocent blood.[2] Still the

the Scottish envoy, to give the same advice to his master. At last, on the 4th of August, James accepted the proposal of Ashby, that he should join the queen, and receive in return a dukedom, with lands, an annuity of five thousand pounds, and entertainment for a guard of one hundred and fifty men.—Ibid. 788. Rymer, xvi. 18.

[1] Dr. Allen was positive that they amounted to two-thirds.—Apud Bridgewater, 374. The same was asserted in a paper found upon Creighton.—Strype, iii. 415.

[2] Ad securitatem capita pontificiorum, quæsitis causis, demetenda. Illa hoc ut crudele consilium aversata—Camd. 566. Therefore

loyalty of the Catholics was subjected to the severest trials. Under the plea of precaution, all recusants convict were placed in custody; a return "of persons "suspected for religion" was required from the magistrates of the capital;[1] in several counties, perhaps in all, domiciliary searches were made; crowds of Catholics of both sexes, and of every rank, were dragged to the common jails throughout the kingdom;[2] and the clergy from their pulpits declaimed with vehemence against the tyranny of the pope and the treachery of the papists.[3] But no provocation could urge them to any act of imprudence. They displayed no less patriotism than their more favoured countrymen. The peers armed their tenants and dependants in the service of the queen; some of the gentlemen equipped vessels, and gave the command to Protestants; and many solicited permission to fight in the ranks as privates against the common enemy.[4]

they were not traitors then, or Elizabeth would not have thought the advice inhuman: but they were to be put to death then, that they might not become traitors afterwards. Her ministers would not have been at any loss for pretexts—quæsitis causis. They were adepts in the art of getting up counterfeit plots.

[1] They amounted to seventeen thousand and eighty-three.—Murdin, 605. Mr. Hallam supposes this to be the number of persons able to bear arms; but the latter are stated in the next page to amount to thirty thousand.

[2] The reader may form some notion of the manner in which such searches were made, from the papers in Lodge, ii. 371—376; and the Loseley MSS. p. 293. See note (U).

[3] The lords lieutenant were ordered "to inquire into the num-"ber, quality, and ability of the recusants; to commit to prison the "most obstinate; and others of value, but not so obstinate, to the "custody of ecclesiastical persons, or gentlemen well-affected, to be supported at their own charge, and kept from intelligence one with another."—December 4, 1587. MS. Life of Shrews. 204.

[4] Stowe, 746. Harleian Miscel. ii. 64. "Not one man ap-"peared to favour the Spaniard; the very papists themselves being "no lesse unwilling than the rest to see their native country in "subjection to the ordinary cruelty found in strangers."—Osborn,

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

The reader will be surprised to learn that, in the midst of these preparations and alarms, both Elizabeth and Philip were employed, and that too with apparent earnestness, in negotiating a peace. The queen still clung to the hope of extricating herself from the danger of invasion. It was in vain that Leicester and Walsingham represented the attempt as calculated to paralyze the efforts of her subjects and to give courage to her enemies;[1] supported by the opinion of Burghley, she named as commissioners the earl of Derby, Lord Cobham, Sir James Croft, and Dale and Rogers, doctors of civil law. They landed at Ostend, and after some preliminary forms, met at Bourbourg, near Calais, the Spanish commissioners, the count of Aremberg, Perenotte, Richardot, De Mas, and Garnier.

Feb. 28. The English opened the conferences with the demand of an armistice; it was granted by the Spaniards, but only for the four cautionary towns possessed by the queen in the Netherlands. They then brought forward three propositions; that the ancient league

28. The ministers themselves in the account which they published in almost all the European languages, under the title of "A letter to "Mendoza," remark that no difference could be observed, on this occasion, between the Protestants and the Catholics; mention with particular praise the viscount Montague, who, with his son and grandson, presented himself before the queen at the head of two hundred horse, that he had raised for the defence of her person; and inform us that the prisoners for religion in Ely signed a declaration of their readiness to fight till death in her cause against all her enemies, were they kings, or priests, or pope, or any other potentate whatsoever. —Ibid. 15, 17, 46.

[1] Walsingham was "very unquiet in mind about the peace."—Lodge, ii. 353. 356. He declared that "all men of judgment "must see that the negotiation would work the queen's ruin."—Hardwicke Papers, i. 357—359. From him we learn that Stafford, the ambassador in France, was in disgrace, because he had sent word that Philip did not deal sincerely in the negotiation; "so "much," he adds, "do we mislike any thing that may hinder the "treaty."—Ibid.

between England and the house of Burgundy should be renewed; that Philip should withdraw his foreign troops from the Low Countries, and that freedom of worship should be allowed to all the inhabitants for the space of at least two years. It was replied that, to the renewal of the league the king of Spain could have no objection; but that it would be imprudent in him to withdraw his forces as long as England and France continued in arms; and that the queen could not be serious in soliciting liberty of conscience for the Protestants of Belgium, as long as she refused it to the Catholics of England. The Spanish commissioners then demanded the restoration of the towns mortgaged to Elizabeth by the States; their opponents required, in return, the repayment of the money which she had advanced. Neither would yield; expedients were suggested and refused; and the conferences continued till the armada had arrived in the mouth of the Channel. It was the general opinion that each party negotiated for the sole purpose of overreaching the other; but, if we may believe the private letters of the ministers, Elizabeth anxiously sought the restoration of peace.[1]

During five years, procrastination had marked the counsels of Philip; on a sudden his caution was exchanged for temerity. The marquess of Santa Crux had objected the danger of navigating a narrow and tempestuous sea without the possession of a single harbour capable of sheltering the fleet; the duke of Parma had solicited permission to reduce the port of Flushing previously to the departure of the expedi-

[1] For the particulars of the negotiation, compare Camden (561, 571) with Strada (l. ix. anno 1587), who contradict each other on one point,—the powers of the Spanish commissioners.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587.

tion; and Sir William Stanley had advised the occupation of Ireland, as a measure necessary to secure the conquest of England. But the king would admit of no delay. He had understood from the pontiff that on his part everything was ready; that the money had been collected, the bull of deposition signed, and the appointment of the legate made out; but that he was resolved not to commit himself by any public act, till he should be assured that the Spanish forces had obtained a footing in England.[1] Philip immediately issued peremptory orders to the admiral that he should put to sea without further delay; to Farnese that he should hold the army in readiness to embark on the first appearance of the fleet near the coast of Flanders. But Santa Crux was already dead,—the victim of his anxiety to satisfy the impatience of his sovereign; and his place was inadequately supplied by the duke of Medina Sidonia, who, like the lord admiral of England, was totally unacquainted with the naval service. Under this new leader the armada sailed from the Tagus. The grandeur of the spectacle

Jan. 31.

March 3.

May 20.

[1] Several writers, among others Spondanus, iii. 29, assert that Allen repaired to Flanders, to accompany the army to England. It is, however, certain that he remained in Rome. Alanum noluit Roma dimittere pontifex, priusquam de belli successu constaret.—Epist. ad Pernium, 110. Olivares never ceased to solicit the bull till he had obtained it: solecitato instancabilmente dall' Olivares.—Tempesti, Vita e Geste de Sixto Quinto, ii. 80; where may be seen the speech of the pontiff when he proposed it to the cardinals. The papal diploma was translated into English; and printed in the Low Countries, that it might be published on the arrival of the Spanish army.—Its contents may be seen in Spondanus, iii. 29; Foulis, 350: and Mr. Butler's Memoirs, iii. 210. In addition was composed and printed at Antwerp, under the title of "An admo-"nition to the nobility and people of England and Ireland," a libellous tract, detailing all the crimes which her enemies imputed to the queen, and calling upon the reader to unite with the Spaniards in punishing so infamous a personage. To it Allen was induced to put his signature. See an account of it in note (X).

excited the most flattering anticipations; and every breast beat high with the hope of conquest and glory. In a few days the delusion was dispelled. Off Cape Finisterre, the southerly breeze was exchanged for a storm from the west; the armada was dispersed along the shores of Gallicia; three galleys ran aground on the coast of France, eight were dismasted, and no ship escaped without considerable damage. To collect and repair his shattered fleet detained the duke three weeks in the harbour of Corunna.[1]

June 9.

This disaster had been announced to Elizabeth as the destruction of the armada, the end of the expedition. If she received the intelligence with joy, she did not forget her usual economy; and the lord admiral received an order to dismantle immediately the four largest ships in the royal navy.[2] Fortunately he ventured to disobey, offering to bear the expense out of his private fortune; and directed his course across the Bay of Biscay to ascertain the real state of the Spanish fleet. But a brisk gale from the south-west compelled him to return; the enemy took advantage of the same wind to leave Corunna; and the English had scarcely moored their ships in the

July 8.

July 12.

[1] The sailing of the Spanish fleet excited some fears in the minds of the commissioners who had superintended the execution of the queen of Scots. On June 26 four of them wrote to the earl of Shrewsbury, to add his signature to a petition to the queen, that the commission might be enrolled in chancery, "as it importeth "your lordship and us all, yours and our posterities, that were any "doers in the case, to have it enroled, to be able to shew sufficient "warrant for our discharge."—H. Kent, A. Paulet, Tho. Andrews, Ro. Beale.

[2] These were the Triumph, of eleven hundred tons, carrying three hundred and forty sailors, one hundred and twenty soldiers, and forty gunners; the White-bear, the Elizabeth Jonas, and the Victory, of one thousand, nine hundred, and eight hundred tons, with a complement of two hundred and sixty sailors, one hundred soldiers, and forty gunners to each.—Murdin, 615, 619, 621.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587. July 19. harbour of Plymouth, when the duke of Medina was discovered off the Lizard Point. Here he summoned the more experienced among his captains to a council of war. They unanimously advised a bold but decisive measure, to bear down on the English fleet, and to attack it while it lay at anchor; but the admiral produced his instructions, which strictly forbade him to provoke hostilities till he had seen the army of Flanders safely landed on the English shore.[1] They July 20. obeyed with reluctance; the armada formed in the shape of a crescent, the horns of which lay some miles asunder, and with a gentle breeze from the south-west proudly advanced up the Channel. It was a magnificent and imposing spectacle. The magnitude of the ships, the unusual construction of the galeasses, their lofty prows and turrets, and their slow and majestic motion, struck the beholders with admiration and awe. The lord admiral had already formed his plan. His vessels, though inferior in bulk and weight of metal, excelled those of the enemy in agility and expedition. To oppose might be dangerous; but he could follow, could annoy from a distance, and might retard their progress by attacking the more sluggish sailers and cutting off the stragglers. Two hours did not elapse before he exchanged a brisk cannonade with Ricaldez, the commander of the rear division, and compelled the duke to detach several ships to his support.

In this action neither fleet suffered any considerable loss; but during the night one of the largest galleons was set on fire by the resentment of a Flemish gunner, who had been reproached by his captain with cowardice or treachery; a second, which had lost a

[1] Strada, l. x. anno 1588. Strype, iv. 280.

mast by accident, fell astern and was captured, after a sharp engagement; and a third, which had separated from the fleet in the dark, met with a similar fate near the coast of France. These disasters proved lessons of caution to the Spanish admiral. His progress became more slow and laborious; the enemy was daring, and the weather capricious; some of his ships were disabled by successive engagements; others were occasionally entangled among the shoals of an unknown coast; and the necessity of protecting both from the incessant pursuit of the English, so retarded his course, that six days elapsed before he could reach his destination and cast anchor in the vicinity of Calais. July 27.

By this time the Spaniards had learned to respect the courage and power of their enemy; to the English the advantages which they had won, though trifling in themselves, imparted that tone of confidence which is often the forerunner of victory. Still the great measure on which depended the fate of England, the transportation of the invading army, remained in suspense. The duke of Parma had completed his preparations; and, with the aid of canals cut through the country, had conveyed his transports to Newport and Dunkirk. In the first of these harbours a division of fourteen thousand men had already embarked; in Dunkirk the other division, almost equal in number, awaited only the orders of the general;[1] and it was expected that on the next day, the second after the arrival of the duke of Medina, the grand attempt would be made. That

[1] Camden represents him as unprepared (577); the contrary is evident from his despatches to Philip, quoted by Strada, l. x. anno 1588.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1587. July 29. July 30.

very night (it was cloudy and boisterous) the sea on a sudden was illuminated by the appearance of eight vessels in flames, drifting rapidly in the direction of the armada. A loud cry of horror burst from the Spaniards, who remembered the blazing boats at the siege of Antwerp, and the destruction which those engines of explosion had scattered on every side. Immediately they cut their cables, ran out to sea, and in their terror and confusion inflicted on each other much greater damage than they had suffered in some of the preceding actions. The fire-ships burnt away harmlessly on the edge of the beach; but, at the moment when the duke congratulated himself on his fortunate escape, a fierce gale began to blow from the south-west; the rain fell in torrents; the glare of the lightning confounded the mariners; and the dawn of morning discovered the armada dispersed along the coast from Ostend to Calais. In a short time a cannonade in the direction of Gravelines collected the adverse fleets. The Spaniards, with forty sail, bravely sustained the attack of their enemy during the day; in the evening the increasing violence of the wind carried them among the shallows and sand-banks near the mouths of the Scheldt. The following morning, with the aid of a favourable breeze, they extricated themselves from danger; but they had lost two galleons, of which one was sunk, the other taken by the Hollanders, and a galeasse of Naples, which had run aground under the batteries of Calais.[1]

The Spanish admiral took the opportunity to con-

[1] With the narratives of our national historians should be compared that by Strada, who had the advantage of consulting the papers of the duke of Parma.—See Camden, 571—579; Stowe 746—759; Strype, iii. App. 266; Strada, l. ix. anno 1588.

sult the most experienced among his officers. His fleet was now reduced to about eighty sail, all of which had suffered considerably; to attempt the transportation of the army, or to return through the Channel, was to throw themselves into the jaws of destruction; and all agreed that but one way remained open, round the north of Scotland and Ireland; a way indeed replete with danger and terror to men unacquainted with the coast, and unused to the tempestuous seas of so high a latitude; but which offered some hope of preserving for their sovereign the shattered remnant of his once formidable navy. For the first time the Spaniards fairly fled before their pursuers; and the want of ammunition compelled the English to return to port, at a time when they might otherwise have annihilated the invaders. The fugitives in their northern course met with no enemy; but they had to contend against the violence of the winds and waves; the shores of Scotland and Ireland were covered with the wrecks of their vessels; and, when the duke of Medina terminated his unfortunate voyage in the port of St. Andero, he acknowledged the loss of thirty ships of the largest class and of ten thousand men.[1] Christoval de Mora, after some contest with his colleagues, undertook to announce the disastrous intelligence to the king. Philip, who had acquired the perfect mastery over his feelings, heard him without any change of countenance, any symptom of emotion. "I thank God," he coolly replied, "who

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1588.

August 8.

September

[1] According to the lists in the letter to Mendoza, there perished, or were taken, before the English fleet returned from the pursuit, fifteen sail, carrying four thousand seven hundred and ninety-one men; and afterwards on the coast of Ireland seventeen sail, with five thousand three hundred and ninety-four men.—Strype, iii. App. 223.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1588.

"has given me so many resources, that I can bear "without inconvenience so heavy a loss. One branch "has been lopt off; but the tree is still flourishing, 'and able to supply its place." Immediately he sent the sum of fifty thousand crowns to be distributed among the survivors; forbade by proclamation any public mourning; and openly returned thanks to God that his fleet had not been entirely destroyed. The Spaniards consoled themselves by attributing their loss to the violence of the weather; the duke of Parma was assured in the strongest terms of the royal favour and approbation; and a fruitless attempt by the English ministers to debauch his fidelity, served only to raise him higher in the estimation of the monarch.[1]

During this important crisis, the queen displayed the characteristic courage of the Tudors. She appeared confident of success; she even talked of meeting the invaders, and of animating her troops to battle by her presence. But this proposal was

[1] It was first reported, that Philip was displeased with the negligence, and jealous of the ambition of the duke; then, that in one of the captured vessels had been found an order to the duke of Medina, to arrest Farnese, as soon as he should come on shipboard, and to send him a prisoner to Spain. This second rumour was traced to the family of the English ambassador in Paris. By the time it could reach the duke in Flanders, Fiesque, a Genoese merchant, presented to him a letter without signature, and, being questioned who was the writer, replied, Pallavicini, the queen's banker in London. This letter advised Farnese to beware of the resentment and suspicion of Philip; to send a confidential friend to Boulogne, where he would be met by an agent from England; and to recollect that he might acquire much more in Flanders than he could ever expect to receive from the gratitude of Spain. The duke understood the hint; that the queen wished him to take possession for himself of the Catholic provinces, and leave the Protestant provinces to the house of Orange. But his fidelity was proof against temptation; he imprisoned the agent, and sent a copy of the letter to Philip.—Strada, l. x. anno 1588.

disapproved by the prudence or the affection of Leicester. "As for your person," he wrote to her, "being the most dainty and sacred thing we have in "this world to care for, I cannot, most dear queen, "consent that you should expose it to danger. For "upon your well doing consists all the safety of your "whole kingdom; and therefore preserve *that* above "all. Yet will I not, that in some sort so princely "and rare a magnanimity should not appear to your "people and to the world, as it is. And thus far, if "it please your majesty, you may do; to draw your-"self to your house at Havering; and to comfort this "army and the people of these counties, you may, if "it please you, spend two or three days to see both "the camps and forts. And thus far, but no further, "can I consent to adventure your person."[1] She followed his advice, and about a fortnight later proceeded to Tilbury. It was a proud moment for Elizabeth. The danger was now over; the armada which had threatened to overturn her throne was struggling with adverse winds on its way to Spain; and the people, intoxicated with joy, expressed the most ardent attachment to her person. Mounted on a white palfrey, and bearing a marshal's truncheon in her hand, she rode along the ranks; the soldiers rent the air with acclamations of triumph; and these raw recruits expressed their regret that they had not been permitted to measure arms with the veteran forces of Spain.[2]

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1588.

July 27.

Aug. 9.

[1] Hardwicke Papers, i. 577.

[2] I have not noticed the speech said to have been spoken by her at Tilbury. It might have been prepared for her as an address to the soldiers, if it had been necessary; but she certainly could not exhort them to fight, after the enemy was gone, and when she had resolved to disband the army immediately.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1588.

The important services of the lord admiral and of his officers were not overlooked by the queen; but, in her estimation, they could not be compared with those of Leicester. He stood without a rival; and to reward his transcendent merit, a new and unprecedented office was created, which would have conferred on him an authority almost equal to that of his sovereign. He was appointed lord lieutenant of England and Ireland; and the warrant lay ready for the royal signature, when the remonstrances of Burghley and Hatton induced her to hesitate; and the unexpected death of the favourite concealed her weakness from the know-

Aug. 18. ledge of the public. Soon after the queen's departure from Tilbury, Leicester had by her order disbanded the army, and set out for his castle of Kenilworth; but, at Cornbury Park, in Oxfordshire, his progress was arrested by a violent disease, which, whether it arose from natural causes, or the anguish of disappointed ambition, or from poison administered by his wife and her supposed paramour, quickly terminated

Sept. 4. his existence.[1] If tears are a proof of affection, those shed by the queen on this occasion showed that hers was seated deeply in the heart; but there was another passion as firmly rooted there,—the love of money, which induced her, at the same time that she lamented the loss of her favourite, to order the public sale of his goods, for the discharge of certain sums which he owed to the exchequer.[2]

[1] See in Wood's Athenæ by Bliss, ii. 74, a curious account of his being poisoned by the countess, whose lover, Christopher Blount, he had attempted to assassinate.

[2] Camden, 583. Several noblemen wrote to her to console her on this occasion. To the earls of Shrewsbury and Derby she answered that "she can admit no comfort otherwise than by sub-"mitting to God's inevitable appointment; the loss of a personage

Leicester in his youth had possessed that external appearance, which was sure to arrest the eye, and warm the heart of Elizabeth. With handsome features and well-proportioned limbs, he joined a tall and portly figure, a qualification necessary for those who aspired to the rank of her favourites. By the spirit of his conversation, the ardour of his flattery, and the expense of his entertainments, he so confirmed the ascendancy which he had acquired, that for thirty years, though he might occasionally complain of the caprice or infidelity of his mistress, he ultimately triumphed over every competitor. As a statesman or a commander, he displayed little ability; but his rapacity and ambition knew no bounds. Many years elapsed before he would resign his pretensions to the hand of his sovereign,[1] and we have just seen, that only the week before his death, he prevailed on her to promise him a much larger share of the royal authority than had ever, in such circumstances, been conferred on a subject. Were we to judge of his moral character from the language of his writings, we should allot to him the praise of distinguished piety;[2] but if we listen

" so dear is a most severe stroke to her in particular, but greater in " respect of the public."—MS. Life of Shrewsbury, 279.

[1] The Scottish queen says, that Elizabeth made to him a promise of marriage.—Murdin, 558. The assertion is confirmed by the despatches of the bishop of Aquila, the Spanish ambassador, still preserved at Simancas. The bishop, who then appeared to be in favour both with the queen and the council, details the artifices employed by Elizabeth and Leicester to induce him to mention their projected marriage to Philip, and to procure from him an answer in its favour. At length, he informs his sovereign, that they had been actually but secretly contracted to each other in the house of the earl of Pembroke.

[2] " I never yet," says Naunton, " saw a style or phrase more " seemingly religious and fuller of the strains of devotion."—Fragmenta regalia, in the Phenix, 193. Such of his letters as are still extant are of this description.

CHAP. VII. A.D. 1588.

to the report of his contemporaries, the delusion vanishes, and he stands before us as the most dissolute and unprincipled of men. We are told, that among the females, married or unmarried, who formed the court of Elizabeth, two only escaped his solicitations; that his first wife was murdered by his order; that he disowned his marriage with the second, for the sake of a more favoured mistress; and that to obtain that mistress he first triumphed over her virtue, and then administered poison to her husband. To these instances has been added a long catalogue of crimes, of treachery to his friends, of assassination of his enemies, and of acts of injustice and extortion towards those who had offended his pride, or refused to bend to his pleasure. The reader will pause before he gives his unqualified assent to such reports; yet, when he has made every allowance for the envy and malice of political enemies, when he has rejected every charge which is not supported by probable evidence, there will still remain much to stamp infamy on the character of Leicester. In the year 1584, the history of his life, or rather of his crimes, was published in a tract entitled, at first, "Copy of a letter . . . "about the present state, and some proceedings of "the earl of Leicester, and his friends in England;" but afterwards known by the name of "Leicester's "Commonwealth." It was generally attributed to the pen of Persons, the celebrated Jesuit; but, whoever might be the author, he had woven his story with so much art, had descended to such minuteness of detail, and had so confidently appealed to the knowledge of living witnesses for the truth of his assertions, that the book extorted the belief and the applause of

its readers.[1] Edition after edition was poured into the kingdom, till the queen herself came forward to vindicate the character of her favourite. She pronounced the writer "an incarnate devil," declared that of her own knowledge (it was a bold expression) she was able to attest the innocence of the earl; and ordered the magistrates to seize and destroy every copy which could be discovered.[2] But, if the will of the sovereign could silence the tongues, it did not satisfy the reason of her subjects. The accomplished Sir Philip Sydney took a different course. He attempted a refutation of the libel. But, with all his abilities, he sunk under the task; he abused the author, but did not disprove the most important of his statements; and the failure alone of so able a scholar and contemporary will justify a suspicion, that there was more of truth in the book than he was willing to admit, and more of crime in the conduct of his uncle than it was in his power to clear away.[3]

[1] Mary Stuart, in a letter to the archbishop of Glasgow (May 18, 1586, O. S.), says that Leicester himself attributed the composition of the book to Morgan, the archbishop, and Lord Paget, jointly, "de quoi il estoyt en une extreme rage contre touz les trois."—Lettres de Marie, vi. 300. Persons, in his preface to the Warnword, denies that he was the author.

[2] Such interposition in favour of a subject may appear extraordinary; but the queen's letter of thanks to Lord and Lady Shrewsbury, for the attention which they had paid to Leicester at Chatsworth, is still more so. In it she almost acknowledges him for her husband. "We should do him great wronge (houlding him in "that place of favor we do) in cace we should not let you undu- "stand in how thanckfull sorte we accept the same at both your "hands, not as don unto him but to our owne self, reputing him "as another ourself," &c.—Lodge, ii. 155.

[3] See it in the Sydney Papers, i. 62.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONDEMNATION OF THE EARL OF ARUNDEL—SUFFERINGS OF THE CATHOLICS—OF THE PURITANS—FAVOUR OF THE EARL OF ESSEX—UNFORTUNATE EXPEDITION AGAINST SPAIN—PROCEEDINGS IN FRANCE—SUCCESSION OF HENRY IV.—SUCCOURS SENT TO HIM FROM ENGLAND—EXECUTION OF LOPEZ—CAPTURE OF CADIZ—PROJECT IN FAVOUR OF A SPANISH SUCCESSOR—ANOTHER EXPEDITION AGAINST SPAIN—SPANISH FLEET IN THE CHANNEL—PEACE BETWEEN FRANCE AND SPAIN—DISSENSIONS IN THE CABINET—EXECUTION OF SQUIRES—DEATH OF BURGHLEY—CONDUCT OF THE KING OF SCOTLAND.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1588.

THE defeat of the armada had thrown the nation into a frenzy of joy. The people expressed their feelings by bonfires, entertainments, and public thanksgivings; the queen, whether she sought to satisfy the religious animosities of her subjects, or to display her gratitude to the Almighty, by punishing the supposed enemies of his worship, celebrated her triumph with the immolation of human victims. A commission was issued; a selection was made from the Catholics in prison on account of religion; and six clergymen were indicted for their priestly character; four laymen for having been reconciled to the Catholic church; and four others, among whom was a gentlewoman of the name of Ward, for having aided, or harboured, priests. All these immediately, and fifteen of their companions, within the three next months, suffered the cruel and infamous punishment

of traitors. It was not so much as whispered that they had been guilty of any act of disloyalty. On their trials nothing was objected to them but the practice of their religion.[1]

Not satisfied with the blood of these victims, the persecutors looked forward to one of more exalted rank. The reader will recollect the fine and imprisonment to which the earl of Arundel had been condemned. For a considerable time after his trial he had been treated with unusual severity; by degrees the rigour of his confinement was relaxed, and he obtained permission to frequent the contiguous cell of William Bennet, one of queen Mary's priests; where he occasionally was present at mass, and met two fellow-prisoners, Sir Thomas Gerard and William Shelley. For this indulgence his countess had given a bribe of thirty pounds to the daughter of the lieutenant; but the result provoked a suspicion that it had been granted with the connivance of some greater personage, who sought the ruin of the noble captive. On the appearance of "the armada," Arundel received a hint that the moment the Spaniards set their feet on English ground, he and the other Catholic prisoners in the Tower would infallibly be massacred. Their danger naturally became the subject of conversation among them; some recommended one expedient, some another; and the earl suggested that they should join in one common form of prayer to solicit the protection of Heaven. The proposal was at first adopted, but afterwards abandoned by the advice of Shelley, under the apprehension that it might be misrepresented to the queen. The armada, however,

[1] Stowe, 749, 750. Challoner, 209—237. Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 126, 128

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1588.

failed; no massacre was attempted; but Shelley, Gerard, and Bennet were removed to different prisons, where they underwent separate examinations respecting the language and conduct of Arundel. The answer of the first was harmless; Gerard represented him as a well-wisher to the Spaniards; and Bennet, if we may believe himself, through fear of the rack and the halter, confessed that the earl had asked him to celebrate mass for the success of the invaders.[1] On these depositions was grounded a charge of high treason; the queen appointed the earl of Derby lord high steward for the trial; and the prisoner was brought to Westminster Hall to plead for his life before that nobleman and twenty-four other peers. The crown lawyers had introduced into

1589. April 18.

[1] On the second examination of the earl, both Gerard and Bennet were introduced; but he was not allowed to speak in their presence, and therefore refused to make answer after they were gone. Burghley put to him the question, "Is not every man a traitor who shall "say that the pope has power to depose the queen?" By the Catholics this question was considered as the forerunner of death; because it was devised to cast a doubt on the sincerity of those who denied the deposing power; and there were many, who, while they denied that power themselves, yet hesitated to declare those traitors who maintained it. The earl replied, "I never yet heard, "any man say that he had; when I do, you shall hear what I say." He was told that he must reply, yes or no. "I wonder," he exclaimed, "that such questions are asked of me, seeing I was never "accused of such matters; but both have been, and am, at all times "ready to serve the queen, with life and limb, against any foreign "prince or potentate whatsoever." Hatton asked, "What, against "the pope?" "Is not the pope?" said the earl in return, "in"cluded in the name of foreign prince or potentate?" The report of his examination was then given to him to read, but he would not sign it, because it stated that he had refused to give any answer to the question; which he declared to be untrue; he had answered it sufficiently to satisfy any reasonable man. In his own account, he says, he knew that he might have answered more clearly in the affirmative, but it was unnecessary, as his death was already determined, and unwise, as his words would, according to custom, have been misrepresented.—MS. Life of the Earl of Arundel, c. xiii.

the indictment all the matter which had formerly been urged in the Star-chamber against him; but the real subject of inquiry lay within a much narrower compass,—whether he had or had not solicited others to pray with him for the success of the Spaniards. The principal witnesses were Gerard and Bennet. When the first appeared, the prisoner called on him, in the name of the living God, to speak the truth, and to remember that he must hereafter give a second account before a most awful tribunal. At this solemn adjuration Gerard trembled, muttered a few words, and was withdrawn. Against the testimony of Bennet was produced one of his own letters, in which he acknowledged that his confession before the commissioners was false, and had been extorted from his weakness by menaces of torture and death;[1] he, on the contrary, to support his credit, asserted that the letter was written by Randal, a fellow-prisoner, and addressed to the earl without his consent or his signature. Randal, however, was not examined; and Arundel most solemnly protested that the prayers which he had proposed had no reference to the invasion; he merely sought the protection of heaven for himself and his companions, who had been threatened with assassination. After an hour's debate, the peers found him guilty; he heard the judgment pronounced with composure and cheerfulness; and begged, as a last favour, that he might be allowed, before his death, to see his wife and his son, a child about five years old, who had been born since his confinement in the Tower. No answer was returned.[2]

[1] See this letter in Strype, iii. App. 250.

[2] MS. Life, c. xiv. State Trials, 1250—1264. Camd. 595—600.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1589.

It must be acknowledged that the queen had some reason to be jealous of this nobleman. The execution of his father, the wrongs which he had lately suffered himself, and his high rank (he was by birth the first peer of the realm), had pointed him out to the queen of Scots, to Morgan, and to many of the exiles, as the fittest person to be placed at the head of any party which might be formed against the government. But his condemnation was an act of policy, not of justice. No one pretended that he had ever assented to such projects; it was not proved that they were so much as known to him. The charge on which he was tried was certainly unfounded. In his subsequent correspondence with the council, in his confidential letters to his wife and his confessor, he always asserted his innocence, and declared his resolution to maintain it, even on the scaffold. Burghley and Hatton advised the queen to spare him. She had taken the life of his father; let her not stain her reputation with the blood of the son. He had now ceased to be a subject of apprehension; he lay at her mercy; on the slightest provocation, on the first appearance of danger, the sentence might be carried into execution. She suffered herself to be persuaded; yet carefully concealed her intention from the knowledge of the prisoner, who lived for several years under the impression that the axe was still suspended over his head, and never rose in the morning without some apprehension that before night he might expire on the scaffold. In 1595 he was suddenly taken ill at table:[1] the skill of his physician checked the rapidity,

[1] After eating of some teal. This circumstance provoked a suspicion of poison; while others attributed his disease to his religious austerities.—Camden, 706. In 1624 his body was transferred to

but could not subdue the force of his disease; and he died at the end of two months, in the eleventh year of his imprisonment. He was buried in the same grave with his father, in the chapel in the Tower.

In her conduct towards this unfortunate nobleman, the queen betrayed an unaccountable spirit of revenge. He seems to have given some deep but secret offence, which, though it was never divulged, could never be forgotten. There was a time when he seemed to engross her favour; when he shone the foremost in all her parties, and bore a principal share in the festivities and gallantries of her court. But, from the moment that he returned to the society of his countess, he was marked out for the victim of her displeasure. During the latter part of his long and severe imprisonment he could not once obtain permission, not even on the approach of death, to see his wife or his children, or any one of his relations, Protestant or Catholic. Nor did the rancour of the queen expire with its principal object. As long as she lived, Lady Arundel was doomed to feel the royal displeasure. She could not remove from her house without danger of offence; she was obliged to solicit permission to visit London even for medical advice; and, whenever Elizabeth meant to repair to St. James's, the countess received an order to quit the capital before the queen's arrival.[1]

From the defeat of the armada till the death of the queen, during the lapse of fourteen years, the Catholics groaned under the pressure of incessant prosecution. Sixty-one clergymen, forty-seven laymen, and two

Arundel; and his son recorded the suspicion in his epitaph. "Non "absque veneni suspicione."—MS. Life, xvi. xviii.

[1] MS. Life of the Countess. See note (Y).

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1590.

gentlewomen, suffered capital punishment for some or other of the spiritual felonies and treasons which had been lately created. Generally the court dispensed with the examination of witnesses: by artful and ensnaring questions an avowal was drawn from the prisoner, that he had been reconciled, or had harboured a priest, or had been ordained beyond the sea, or that he admitted the ecclesiastical supremacy of the pope, or rejected that of the queen. Any one of these crimes were sufficient to consign him to the scaffold. Life, indeed, was always offered, on the condition of conformity to the established worship; but the offer was generally refused; the refusal was followed by death; and the butchery, with very few exceptions, was performed on the victim while he was yet in perfect possession of his senses.[1]

[1] See the histories of most of them collected in Challoner's Memoirs of Missionary Priests, vol. i. There are many letters extant, describing the horror which these executions excited in other nations. "Their resolution and manner of death," says Standen, "being set out to the world in print, in sundry languages, hath "bred such a hatred against the regiment of the realm in general, as "most are scandalized therewith." Hitherto these rigours had been attributed to Leicester and Walsingham; their continuance was ascribed to the counsels of Burghley, who "was now considered "by all the Catholics in Christendom an open, declared, and pro- "fessed enemy to their faith and religion, never having plucked off "his mask till these latter years."—Birch, i. 84, 89. Burghley replies: "That though their outward pretence be to be sent from the "seminaries, to convert people to their religion, yet, without recon- "ciling them of their obedience to the queen, they never give them "absolution. Such in our realm as refuse to come to our churches, "and yet do not discover (disown) their obedience to the queen, be "taxed with fines according to the law, without danger of their "lives. And if Mr. Standen were truly informed of this manner of "proceeding, and would judge indifferently thereof, he might "change his mind."—Birch, i. 94. The first part of the answer is undoubtedly false; the second is an open avowal of persecution. It appears, however, from a paper in his handwriting, that he wished priests to be hanged only, and "that the manner of drawing "and quartering were forborne."—Strype, iii. 622. I may add,

These executions, however, affected but a small part of the Catholic population; the general grievance consisted in the penalties of recusancy. If we consider the relative value of money, we shall see that it required an ample fortune to pay the perpetual fine of twenty pounds per lunar month. Most gentlemen were compelled to sell a considerable portion of their property, that they might satisfy the demand; and, whenever they were in arrear, the queen was empowered by law to seize the whole of their personal and two-thirds of their real estate every six months.[1] For this purpose, returns of the names and of the property of the recusants in each county were repeatedly required by the council; and the best expedient of the sufferers was to prevail on the queen, through the influence of her favourites, to accept an annual composition.[2] Yet even then they were not allowed to live in quiet. They were still liable to a year's imprisonment and a fine of one hundred marks for every time that they heard mass; on each successive rumour of invasion they were confined, at their own charges, in the jail of the county;[3] they were

that there are several contemporary lists of the clergymen who suffered this cruel punishment for the sole exercise of their ministry during the reign of the queen. The first victim, Thomas Woodhouse, was followed by one hundred and twenty-three others; that is, one hundred and thirteen secular priests, eight Jesuits, one monk, and one friar. Moreover, thirty men and two women were executed as felons for the crime of harbouring and abetting priests, besides numbers of clergymen and laymen, who died of their sufferings in prison.

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 771.

[2] These compositions were so unwelcome to Cooper, bishop of Winchester, that he petitioned the council to remove the compounders out of the shire, "to some place where they might do less "harm."—Strype, iii. 240, 419.

[3] The zeal of Topcliffe, not content with the incarceration of the men, wished the women also to be confined; "seeing far greater is

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1590.

assessed, as often as it appeared proper to the council, in certain sums towards the levy of soldiers for the queen's service; and, on their discharge from prison, they were either confined in the house of a Protestant gentleman, or, if they were permitted to return to their homes, were made liable to the forfeiture of their goods, lands, and annuities during life, for the new offence of straying more than five miles from their own doors.[1] Yet many of these men had signed declarations of loyalty which satisfied the council, and had engaged to fight in defence of their sovereign against any foreign prince, pope, or potentate whomsoever.[2] They were treated in this manner, if we may believe Burghley himself, not so much for their own demerits, as to prove to the queen's enemies abroad, that in the case of invasion they must expect to derive little aid from the more wealthy of the Catholic body in England.[3]

Thus it was with men of property. Recusants in meaner circumstances were at first thrown into prison. But the jails were soon crowded; the counties complained of the expense of their maintenance; and the queen ordered them to be discharged at the discretion of the magistrates. From some nothing more was required than a promise of good behaviour; some had their ears bored with a hot iron; others were publicly whipped.[4] It was afterwards enacted, that all recu-

"the fury of a woman once resolved to evil, than the rage of a "man."—His proposal to Burghley is in Strype, iv. 39.

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 843.

[2] See some of these oaths in Strype, iii. 191, 564; Kirby's Suffolk Traveller, 193; Strype's Whitgift, 277.

[3] Strype's Whitgift, 327. See note (Z).

[4] Bridgewater, 375. Strype, iii. 169. The numbers were so great, that at one sessions in Hampshire, four hundred, at the assizes in Lancashire, six hundred recusants were presented.—

sants, not possessing twenty marks a year, should conform within three months after conviction, or abjure the realm, under the penalty of felony without benefit of clergy, if they were afterwards found at large. But the severity of the act defeated its purpose; and the magistrates contented themselves with occasionally granting commissions to their officers to visit a certain district, and to levy discretional sums on the poorest recusants, as a composition for the legal fine.[1]

In addition to these sufferings must be mentioned the domiciliary visits in search of Catholic clergymen, which have formerly been described. At first they were events of rare occurrence; but now they were repeated frequently in the year, often on the slightest suspicion, on the arrival of a stranger, on the groundless information of an enemy, a discharged servant, or a discontented tenant; sometimes for the sole purpose of plunder, and sometimes through the hope of reward, as the forfeiture of the estate followed the apprehen-

Id. 478. App. 98. Cooper, bishop of Winchester, to get rid of them, presented "a humble petition that one hundred or two lusty "men, well able to labour, might by some commission be taken up, "and sent into Flanders, as pyoners and labourers for the armys." —Ibid. 169.

[1] Stat. of Realm, iv. 844. I have in my possession a curious manuscript account of the exactions of William Ratcliff, an officer, who, about Christmas, 1589, proceeded through most of the villages in Cleveland, with a commission for this purpose from Carey, Constable, and Rokesby, three magistrates. Felton was another employed for a similar purpose. "Felton hath at lengthe obtayned "his long desyred sute, viz., 3s. 4d. in the pounde of all that he "hath alreadye or shall hereafter entitle her majestie unto of "the landes or goodes of recusantes, which will amounte to £500 "per annum, and this by the mediation of Sir John Stanhopp." "Felton proceedeth with all violence against all sortes of recu- "santes, and his courses, be they never so unjuste or unconscion- "able, ar maintayned by the L. Treasorer, chiefe justice, chiefe "baron, and Sir John Stanhopp."—May 26, 1602. Private MS. letters of the time.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1590.

sion of the priest. This, in the memorials of the age, is described as the most intolerable of grievances. It was in vain that the Catholic gentleman withdrew himself from the eyes of the public, and sought an asylum in solitude. His house afforded him no security; even in the bosom of his family he passed his time in alarm and solicitude; and was exposed at every moment to the capricious visits of men, whose pride was flattered by the wanton exercise of authority over their betters, or whose fanaticism taught them to believe that they rendered a service to God by insulting and oppressing the idolatrous papist.[1]

It was observed that among those who gloried in the execution of "these godly laws," none were more distinguished by their violence than the Protestant recusants.[2] But, if Elizabeth allowed them to display

[1] Such at least are the complaints of the sufferers in several manuscript papers in my possession. The searches sometimes comprised a whole district. In 1584 fifty gentlemen's houses were visited on the same night, and almost all the owners dragged to prison.—Bridgewater, 299. Cooper proposed that they should take place every three weeks or month.—Strype, iii. 240. In Lodge may be seen instances of the injustice which was often committed on such occasions. Sir Godfrey Foljambe apprehended his grandmother, and promised, "by God's helpe to keep her safely."—Lodge, ii. 375. The result showed the real object of this godly grandson. When, after a confinement of twenty months, the council ordered Lady Foljambe to be restored to liberty, he complied; but still kept "her living, goods, and chattels," for his own use.—Ibid. 372. In the same search, two priests were discovered at Padley, a house belonging to Sir Thomas Fitzherbert, and inhabited by his brother. The earl of Shrewsbury, without further ceremony, took possession of the house and demesne of Padley, and, finding there the deeds of another estate, called Foultcliff, kept them, and entered on that property also; "things," says Sir Thomas, "greater than my presente poore estate can "suffer, or in any wise bear, I payinge her majesty the statute of "recusancie, being 240*l.* by yeare, which is more than all my rents "yearlie rise unto."- -Ibid. 402. See note (AA).

[2] Some of them were animated with such a hatred of idolatry, as they termed it, that they travelled as far as Rome, to display their

their zeal by tormenting her Catholic subjects, she was still watchful that they did not lay their irreverent hands on the book of Common Prayer, and continued to prohibit the new form of service which they had established for themselves. Their petitions for favour, the suggestions of their friends in the council, the efforts of their brethren in parliament, failed to move her resolution. At last their patience was exhausted. They appealed to the public with all the bitterness of disappointed zeal; and the friends of the establishment were surprised and alarmed by a succession of hostile and popular pamphlets. The titles of these writings were quaint, their language declamatory and scurrilous, their object to bring the hierarchy into discredit and contempt. But the queen threw over the clergy the shield of her protection. She issued a severe proclamation against the authors, publishers, and possessors of seditious libels,[1] and the court of the Star-chamber restrained the exercise of the art of printing to the metropolis and the two universities; to a single press in each of these, and to a certain number in London, with a prohibition to print, sell, bind, or stitch any work which had not previously obtained the approbation of the bishop or archbishop.[2] Yet, in defiance of these regulations, copies of the more obnoxious publications were multiplied and circulated through every part of the kingdom. They

zeal. The excesses and answers of these fanatics may be seen in Maffei, Annali, ii. 217, 218, 219.

[1] "On Friday last Sir Richard Knightley, Hooles of Coventry, "Wigsome and his wife of Warwick, were condemned in the star-"chamber, as furtherers of the book called Martin Mar-prelate, to "pay, the first £2000, the second 1000 marks, the third 500, the "fourth 100, and to be imprisoned during the queen's pleasure."—Sir H. Lee to Lord Shrewsbury, Feb. 17, 1590.

[2] See the original in Strype's Whitgift, App. 94.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1590.

issued from an ambulatory press, which was secretly conveyed from house to house, and from county to county. But no ingenuity could long elude the vigilance of the pursuivants. The palladium of the ultra-reformers was discovered, and demolished in the vicinity of Manchester.

One of these works, entitled "A Demonstration of "Discipline," had been traced to the pen of Udal,

1591. March.

a Puritan minister. He was brought to trial at Croydon. The jury, on very questionable evidence, found him guilty of the fact; the court, on still more questionable grounds, determined that the book was a libel on the person of the queen, because it inveighed against the government of the church established by her authority. By this decision he was brought within the operation of the statute originally framed against

1592. Feb. 20.

the Catholics. But, though he received judgment of death, intercession was made in his favour by the king of Scots and Sir Walter Raleigh; by degrees he recanted most of his opinions unfavourable to the establishment; and his pardon was already made

June 15.

out, when he died in prison, a victim to the anxiety of his own mind and the severity of his confinement.[1]

1591. May.

Cartwright, the leader of the nonconformists, with nine of his associates, had been summoned before the

[1] State Trials, i. 1271. Strype, iv. 21—30. Strype's Whitgift, 375—377. The seditious passages in the indictment were these: "Who can without blushing deny you (the bishops) to be the "cause of all ungodliness? . . . . . the government giveth leave "unto a man to be anything save a sound Christian. You retain "the Popish hierarchy first reigning in the midst of the mystery "of iniquity," &c. Against him it was maintained, that the bishops were part of the queen's body politic, and therefore, by depraving them, he had depraved her.—See several papers respecting his trial and submission in Strype, iv. 21—30.

ecclesiastical commission, and refused to answer interrogatories upon oath. Such a demand was, he contended, contrary to the law of the land, and to the law of God. In the Star-chamber they all persisted in their refusal. Their obstinacy was punished with imprisonment; but it gave rise to an animated controversy, which, though of no benefit to these individuals, contributed to open the eyes of men to the injustice of administering to prisoners the oath ex officio, and thus placing them under the cruel necessity of committing perjury, or of bearing witness against themselves.[1]

At this time the resentment of the queen had been stimulated by the ungovernable fanaticism of three members of the communion. Hacket, a person of low birth, and not a very creditable character, had listened to the exhortations of some of the preachers. He soon put on the appearance of superior sanctity, made pretension to supernatural powers, and professed to believe that his body was animated with the soul of John the Baptist. The magistrates of Lincoln vainly endeavoured to convince him of the delusion by a public whipping; from the tail of the cart he hastened to London, to prepare the way of the Lord before his second coming; and to denounce, as the prophet of vengeance, the plagues which would fall on the realm, in consequence of its opposition to a thorough reformation. He was accompanied by Coppinger and Arthington, two gentlemen of slender fortunes, whose

[1] Fuller, 198. Neal, c. viii. Strype's Whitgift, 336, 362, 366. App. 142. In defence of this oath it was urged that, licet nemo tenetur seipsum prodere, tamen proditus per famam tenetur seipsum ostendere et purgare. Moreover, that the penance enjoined was, not per modum pœnæ, sed medicinæ.—See the judgment of nine doctors of civil law in Strype's Whitgift, App. 137; Camden, 636.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1591.

enthusiasm led them to believe in the divine mission of Hacket. One morning they issued from his lodgings, as the prophets of judgment and mercy, ran through the streets, exclaiming, "Repent, England, "repent!" and at Charing Cross harangued the people from a waggon. They declared that the reformation was at hand; that Hacket, as the representative of Christ, and clothed in the glorified body of the Messiah, was come with his fan in his hand to separate the wheat from the chaff; that he was king of the world; that all princes must acknowledge him for their sovereign; and that the queen would be deprived of her crown for her opposition to the godly work of reformation. The people heard them with astonishment, but without applause. Unable to procure followers, they returned to Hacket; and all three were apprehended and committed as traitors. Hacket died, venting the most horrid blasphemies; Coppinger starved himself, or was starved in prison; Arthington read his recantation and obtained his pardon.[1]

July 19.

July 26.

At first the extravagance of these fanatics threw considerable odium on the cause of the imprisoned ministers. It was pretended that, if a rising had been effected, men of greater weight would have placed themselves at the head of the insurgents, and have required from the queen the abolition of the prelacy.

[1] Stowe, 760. Collier, ii. 627, 630. Camden, 630, 634. Strype, iv. 68. On examination, they all declared that they were moved by the spirit to act as they had done. The two prophets refused to uncover their heads, because they were of higher dignity than the commissioners. Hacket was indicted: 1. That he said that the queen had forfeited the crown. 2. That he had thrust a bodkin into that part of her picture which represented her heart He pleaded guilty on the first, and stood mute on the second.—Strype, iv. 68.

But no proof could be brought of any such projects; the visionary schemes of the three prophets were condemned by the more moderate of their brethren; and the cause of Cartwright and his associates, when the surprise of the public had subsided, was again left to its own merits. After some time, the bishops retired from a contest in which they found themselves abandoned by the majority of the council; and the prisoners, at the end of eighteen months, were discharged, on a promise of good behaviour.[1]

1593. Feb. 27.

Their refusal, however, to take the oath ex officio, gave rise to a motion, in the next session of parliament, for a reform in the practice of the ecclesiastical courts. But the attempt was crushed in its infancy by the despotism of the queen, who, sending that afternoon for the speaker, bade him remind the house that she had the power to call or dissolve the parliament; to assent to, or to dissent from, its proceedings; that she had already forbidden them to interfere in subjects above their capacities, matters of state, or causes ecclesiastical; that she wondered at their presumption and disobedience; and therefore commanded them never hereafter to entertain any motion, and him on his allegiance never to read to the house any bill, which might have a reference to such questions. Neither did she content herself with this reprimand. Morrice, the mover of the question, was arrested by a serjeant at arms in his place, was deprived of his office in the court of wards, was disabled from practising as a barrister, and was imprisoned for several years in the castle of Tutbury.[2]

By an act in this parliament, the Protestant, like the

[1] Strype's Whitgift, 370. App. 154.
[2] Townshend, 60. D'Ewes, 478. Neal, c. viii.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1593.

poorer Catholic recusant, was made liable to the penalty of banishment, or felony without benefit of clergy, unless he conformed within three months after conviction. But the Puritans were by this time divided into two parties. The majority, the disciples of Cartwright and his associates, did not object to some parts of the established service, or to the administration of the sacrament as it was performed in many churches. These, therefore, by occasional and partial attendance, eluded the severity of the law. But there were others, named Brownists, or Separatists, who deemed every species of communion with an unchristian church a pollution of their consciences; and, under this conviction, braved with obstinacy the

March 23.

threats and power of the queen. To intimidate them, five of their number were arraigned on the charge of writing and publishing seditious libels. The plea that the obnoxious passages were directed against the bishops, and not against the queen, was overruled; and, though the publishers were spared, Barrow and Greenwood, the writers, suffered the punishment of

April 6.

death.

Penry, a minister, was the next victim. Among his papers had been discovered a collection of unconnected sentences, said to reflect on the character of the queen; because in them he expressed a suspicion that she supported the cause of the gospel, not through attachment to religion, but with a view to her own interest. He protested that they were nothing more than the heads of a petition which he purposed to compose; and maintained that, as they had never been communicated to any other person, they could not have been a writing in the meaning of the statute. Still the jury found him guilty;

and, to prevent any riot at the time of execution, he was suddenly called out after dinner, and hung at St. Thomas Waterings.[1] May 25.

These executions might awaken the apprehensions, they did not subdue the obstinacy of the Separatists. Many were imprisoned; some were convicted of recusancy; a few were banished. But the queen had now grown old; the king of Scots, her presumptive heir, professed Puritanical principles; and the leaders of the orthodox party saw the danger of persisting in a course which might draw upon themselves the vengeance of the next sovereign. The persecution subsided by degrees; and the Separatists enjoyed a state of comparative tranquillity, long before the death of Elizabeth. May 29.

From these religious contests, which placed in so strong a light the stern intolerant spirit of the age, we may now turn to the foreign wars and domestic intrigues which occupied the attention of the queen till the end of her reign. As soon as the intoxication of joy excited by the defeat of the armada had subsided, she began to calculate the expense of the victory, and stood aghast at the enormous amount. A forced loan offered the readiest way of procuring an immediate supply. The merchants of the city were rated according to their supposed ability to pay; privy seals were despatched to the lords lieutenant of the different counties; and every recusant of fortune, every individual suspected for religion, almost every gentleman who possessed not some powerful friend at court, was compelled to advance the sum

[1] Stowe, 765. Strype's Whitgift, 410—415. App. 176. Strype's Annals, iv. 176. He was supposed to be the author of Martin Marprelate, and was therefore treated with this barbarity.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1589. March 8.

at which he had been taxed.[1] In a short time the convocation and parliament assembled. From the former the queen received a grant of two subsidies of six shillings in the pound; from the latter, of two subsidies of four shillings, and four tenths and fifteenths. With this liberal vote the commons coupled a petition to the throne. As the terror of the Spanish arms was now dispelled, men thought of nothing but revenge and conquest; and the house prayed the queen to punish the insult which she had received from Philip, by carrying the scourge of war into his dominions.[2] Elizabeth praised the spirit of her affectionate people; but her exchequer was exhausted; she had no money to advance; she might supply ships of war and a few bands of veteran soldiers, but her subjects must furnish the rest from their own resources. An association was quickly formed, at the head of which appeared the names of Norris and Drake, men who were justly esteemed the first in the military and naval service; and under their auspices an armament of nearly two hundred sail, carrying twenty-one thousand men, was collected in the harbour of Plymouth.

The reader will recollect that Lætitia, the dowager countess of Essex, had married the earl of Leicester, who introduced her son, the earl of Essex, to the

[1] Murdin, 632. Lansdowne MSS. lvi. 3, 4; lvii. 4. In Lodge, ii. 387, is a ludicrous instance of the power assumed by the commissioners. Bagot, employed by Lord Shrewsbury to receive the money, writes to him in favour of Jolliffe, to whom a privy seal had been sent; and proceeds thus: "There is one Reynold Devill, "a man of great wealth, without wiff or charge, a usurer by occu-"pacion, and worth M. lb. He will never do good in his contree. "It were a charitable deede for your lordship to impose it (Jolliffe's "share) upon *him*."

[2] Wilk Con. iv. 340. D'Ewes, 454.

queen. His youth, and address, and spirit, soon captivated Elizabeth. She made him her master of the horse; on the appearance of the armada she appointed him (he was then almost twenty-one years old) to the important office of captain-general of the cavalry; and, when she visited the camp, ostentatiously displayed her fondness for him in the eyes of the whole army, and honoured him for his bloodless services with the order of the garter. On the death of Leicester he succeeded to the post of prime favourite; the queen required his constant attendance at court; and her indulgence of his caprice cherished and strengthened his passions. But the company of "the "old woman" had few attractions for the volatile young nobleman; and the desire of glory, perhaps the hope of plunder (for he was already twenty-two thousand pounds in debt), taught him to turn his eyes towards the armament at Plymouth.[1] Without communicating his intention to the queen, he suddenly disappeared from court, rode with expedition to Plymouth, embarked on board the Swiftsure, a ship of the royal navy, and instantly put to sea, with the intention of following the fleet, which had sailed several days before. He was scarcely departed, when the earl of Huntingdon arrived, with orders to arrest the fugitive, and bring him back a prisoner to the feet of his sovereign. Finding that he was too late, he sent a copy of the royal instructions to the commanders of the expedition.[2]

April 1

In their company was Don Antonio, prior of Crato, who had unsuccessfully contended with Philip for the crown of Portugal. The queen had given orders that

[1] Murdin, 634.

[2] Lodge, ii. 385. Camden, 602.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1589. — they should first attempt to raise a revolution in his favour; and, if that failed, should scour the coast of the peninsula, and inflict on the subjects of Philip every injury in their power.[1] But Drake had too long been accustomed to absolute command in his freebooting expeditions. He refused to be shackled April 21. by instructions, and sailed directly to the harbour of Corunna. Several sail of merchantmen and ships of war fell into his hands; the fishermen's town or suburb was taken; and the magazines, stored with oil and wine, became the reward of the conquerors. But it was in vain that a breach was made in the wall of the place itself; every assault was repulsed, and three hundred men perished by the unexpected fall of a tower. By this time the conde d'Andrada had intrenched himself at the Puente de Burgos. Norris marched against him with an inferior force; the first attempt to cross the bridge failed; the next succeeded; and the invaders had the honour of pursuing their opponents more than a mile. But it was a barren honour, purchased with the loss of many valuable lives.[2]

From Corunna the commanders wrote to the queen an exaggerated account of their success, but informed her that they had received no tidings of the earl of May 13. Essex. That nobleman waited for them at sea, and

[1] Lodge, ii. 397.

[2] Ibid. 389—395. Birch, i. 58. Camden, 600—602. Norris and Drake appear to have been proficients in the art of composing official despatches. They tell the council that in these battles, which were fiercely contested, they killed one thousand of the enemy with the loss of only three men.—Lodge, ibid. But Lord Talbot writes to his father: "As I hear privately, not without the loss of "as many of our men as of theirs, if not more; and without the gain "of any thing, unless it were honour, and the acquainting our men "with the use of their weapons."—Ibid. 396.

accompanied them to Peniche, on the coast of Portugal. On their arrival it was resolved to land; Essex leaped the first into the surf; and the castle was instantly taken. Thence the fleet sailed to the mouth of the Tagus; the army marched through Torres Vedras and St. Sebastian to Lisbon. But the cardinal Albert, the governor of the kingdom, had given the command to Fonteio, an experienced captain, who destroyed all the provisions in the vicinity, and having distributed his small band of Spaniards in positions the best adapted to suppress any rising in the city, patiently waited the arrival of the enemy. The English advanced without opposition; Essex with his company knocked at the gate for admittance; but the moment they retired the Spaniards sallied out in small parties, and surprised the weak and the stragglers. At length sickness and want compelled Norris to abandon the enterprise; not a sword had been drawn in favour of Antonio; and, in spite of the prayers and the representations of that prince, the army marched to Cascaes, a town already captured and plundered by Drake. From Cascaes the expedition sailed on its return to England; and the next day was separated by a storm into several small squadrons. One of these took and pillaged the town of Vigo; the others, having suffered much from the weather, and still more from the vigorous pursuit of Padilla with a fleet of seventeen galleys, successively reached Plymouth. Of the twenty-one thousand men who sailed on this disastrous expedition, not one-half, and out of eleven hundred gentlemen not more than one-third, lived to revisit their native country.[1] The

May 27.

[1] Camden makes the number of men employed in the expedition

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1589.

queen rejoiced that she had retaliated the boast of invasion upon Philip, but lamented the loss of lives and treasure with which it had been purchased. The blame was laid by her on the disobedience and rapacity of the two commanders; by them partly on each other, partly on the heat of the climate, and the intemperance of the men. But these complaints were carefully suppressed; in the public accounts the loss was concealed; every advantage was magnified; and the people celebrated with joy the triumph of England over the pride and power of Spain.[1]

Essex, on his return, found the court divided between the factions of two competitors for the royal favour, Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Charles Blount. With Raleigh the reader is already acquainted, as formerly the rival of Hatton. When Hatton was raised to the chancellorship, Raleigh retained the office of captain of the guard, and was careful to improve the opportunity which that situation afforded him of advancing his own interests. He obtained from the queen an extension of his valuable monopoly, the prisages of wines, a grant of the lands forfeited by Babington in Derbyshire, and another grant to the amount of twelve thousand acres near Cork, being parcel of the lands forfeited by the

twelve thousand five hundred, and that of the missing at its return six thousand (Camden, 601, 605); which, if he confine it to the army, will agree with more certain accounts. Baillie, the captain of the Mary German, wrote to Lord Shrewsbury from Plymouth, that the land forces amounted to twenty thousand men, which must be an exaggeration. Fenner, who held a high command in the fleet, gives the numbers in the text. It was, he adds, "a miserable "action;" nor could he write with his hand, what his heart thought.—Birch, i. 58.

[1] See the despatches in Lodge, ibid.; Birch, i. 58—61; Strype, iv. 8; Camden, 601—605; Stowe, 751, 756; Maffei, Hist. ab excessu Gregorii XIII. l. ii. 48, 49.

Desmonds in Ireland.[1] Raleigh's rival was Sir Charles Blount, the second son of Lord Mountjoy, and a student in the Inner Temple. One day the queen singled him out from the spectators as she dined in public, inquired his name, gave him her hand to kiss, and bade him remain at court. This was sufficient to point him out to Raleigh as a rival; but the earl of Essex, on his return, assumed a proud superiority over them both; and Raleigh, when he ventured to come into collision with that young nobleman, received from the queen an order to leave England, and go and plant his twelve thousand acres in Ireland. Blount was more fortunate at a tilting-match. Elizabeth to show her approbation, sent him a chess-queen of gold, which he bound to his arm with a crimson ribbon. The jealousy of Essex induced him to remark, that "now every fool must have his "favour;" and the pride of Blount demanded satisfaction for the insult. They fought; Essex was wounded in the thigh; and the queen gratified her vanity with the conceit, "that her beauty had been "the object of their quarrel." By her command they were reconciled; and in process of time became sincere and assured friends.[2] CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1589.

But the attention of Elizabeth was soon absorbed by the extraordinary and important events which rapidly succeeded each other in France. In the last year the king had silently introduced a body of troops into Paris, that he might awe, perhaps punish, the factious demagogues who had obtained the uncontrolled ascendant over the minds of the citizens. The populace rose; chains were thrown across the 1588. May 2. Sept. 22.

[1] Birch, i. 56. Naunton, in the Phenix, 209.
[2] Naunton, 212. Osborn, 32.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1588. streets; the soldiers, insulated in small bodies from each other, surrendered; and the duke of Guise became master of the capital.[1] An assembly of the states was next convoked at Blois, where the king resolved to despatch by treachery a subject whom he Dec. 3. was not allowed to punish by justice. By his orders the duke was assassinated in the passage to the royal chamber; and the next day the cardinal of Guise suffered the same fate; while the cardinal of Bourbon, with the chiefs of the party, was committed to prison.[2] This intelligence threw the inhabitants of the capital into the most violent ferment; the two brothers were extolled as martyrs; and the streets, the churches, and the public halls resounded with cries of vengeance. The duke of Mayenne, the third brother, hastened from Lyons to Paris, and took upon himself, with the title of governor, the exercise of the sovereign authority. Had the king acted with rigour, he might perhaps have crushed the hydra that opposed him; by delay, he suffered his opponents to recover from their consternation; and, as a last resource, was compelled to throw himself into the arms of the king of Navarre.

The two monarchs with united forces advanced towards Paris. Within its walls, religious frenzy had reached the utmost height. Formerly the doctrine that the people possessed the right of deposing and punishing their sovereigns had been confined to Knox, Goodman, and Languet;[3] of late it had been adopted by the university of Paris, was acknowledged by the

[1] Consult Griffet, De la journée des Barricades, Daniel, xi. 439.
[2] See the Hardwicke Papers, i. 281, 296; Camden, 607.
[3] Languet was the author of Junius Brutus, published by Duplessis Mornai.

new parliament, and inculcated by the preachers from the pulpit. They pronounced the king an apostate, an assassin, and a tyrant; he was said to have forfeited his title to the sovereignty; and men were exhorted to free the kingdom from the rule of the monster. Jacques Clement, a young Dominican friar, of weak intellect and strong feelings, undertook the task. On the credit of a forged letter from Harlay, first president of the parliament, he obtained an introduction to Henry; and, as the king bent forward to hear him, plunged a knife into his bowels. The monarch exclaimed that he was murdered; his guards burst into the room; and Clement was immediately slain.[1] This hasty vengeance unfortunately prevented the examination of the culprit; and it could never be ascertained whether the project originated with himself, or had been suggested to him by others.

Henry died the next day; and the king of Navarre, the descendant of St. Louis, by his youngest son, Robert, count of Clermont, took the title of Henry IV., king of France and Navarre. Many of the Catholic nobility had hitherto adhered to the royal cause, in

[1] The following is the deposition of Bellegarde, who was present: "Aujourd'hui environs les huict heures, estant en la chambre du "roi, qui estoit sur sa chaize d'affaires, sa majestè a dict audict "Jacobin ce qu'il avoit à dire. Lequel Jacobin a répondu en ces "motz, Sire, Monsieur le premier president se porte bien, et vous "baise les mains, et après ces motz a dict au procureur général quil "voudroit bien parler au roi à part . . . . et voyant sa majestè "que ledict Jacobin faisoit difficultè de parler, lui a dict en ces motz, "approchez vous: ce que ledict Jacobin a faict, et s'est mis en la "place dudict sieur deposant, ou incontinent il a ouy sadite majestè, "pui hausant sa voix a dict, ha mon dieu, qui a etè cause que ledict "sieur deposant a tournè la teste, ou il a veu sa dicte majestè, "debout, qui tiroit de son corps ung costeau, duquel a plein bras "il a par deux foys frappè ledict Jacobin dans la face, lui disant: "ha, meschant tu m'as tuè."—Daniel, xi. 505, notes.

CHAP. VI. A.D. 1589.

opposition to the league; but, before they would acknowledge the new sovereign, they compelled him to sign a paper, by which he engaged not to suffer the public exercise of any other than the Catholic worship, except in the towns in which it was already established; not to give offices in cities and corporations to any but Catholics; to maintain the rights and privileges of the princes, nobles, and all other faithful subjects; to punish the contrivers of the murder of the late king; and to permit the Catholic lords to acquaint the pontiff with the reasons of their conduct. But the king was unable to satisfy the bigots of either party. On the one side several Catholic gentlemen, distrusting his sincerity, left the royal camp with their followers; on the other, nine regiments of Protestants refused to fight under the colours of a sovereign who had engaged to support what they deemed an idolatrous worship.[1] Weakened by desertions, Henry raised the siege of Paris, divided his army, and retired with a small force into Normandy. The duke of Mayenne pursued; but the king intrenched himself at Arques, near Dieppe, and repulsed the army of the enemy, though four times as numerous as his own. Within a few days he received from Elizabeth the sum of twenty thousand pounds in gold to pay his foreign troops, and an aid of four thousand Englishmen, under the command of Lord Willoughby. He was now able to act offensively. By a forced march he retraced his steps, surprised the suburbs of Paris on the left of the river, returned by Tours into Normandy, and reduced several towns of importance. During the campaign the English supported by their bravery the honour of their country; but they suffered

August 4.

Sept. 21.

[1] Camden, 662.

severely in several actions; and the survivors were dismissed with thanks in the beginning of the following year.[1] CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1589.

The duchy of Bretagne, originally a female fee, had been annexed to the French crown by a marriage with a female. Hence it was now claimed by the king of Spain for his daughter, the infanta, as representative of her mother Elizabeth of France; and at the same time by the duke of Mercœur, in right of his wife, a descendant of the ancient princes of the country. Instead of opposing each other, they agreed to postpone the settlement of their respective claims till they had effected the conquest of the duchy. Mercœur obtained possession of several of the principal towns; and the Spaniards, having landed five thousand men, took the harbours of Blavet and Hennebon. Hitherto the solicitations of Henry for assistance, his flattery of the queen, his letters of compliment and attachment, had been of little avail. Elizabeth was liberal of her promises, but administered relief with a slow and sparing hand.[2] He had, indeed, some powerful advo- 1590. October.

[1] Camden, 610, 611.

[2] "Elle est plus couarde de mettre main à la bourse, qu'elle n'eut "esté de la mettre à l'espée, si elle eust esté homme."—Egert. 336. It is amusing to observe how the French ambassadors complain of the king's inattention to gratify the vanity of the queen by frequently writing to her. He should send her a short note every fortnight. His letters, so "delicates et pleines d'affection," are of more avail than all their reasoning. In fact, she began to coquette with Henry soon after the arrival of the ambassadors. "Elle nous mena en sa "chambre secrette, ou elle nous fit monstre de votre beau pourtraict, "avec telle demonstration qu'elle nous cuida sembler, qu'elle en "aymeroit mieux le vifs .... tant y a qu'elle ne se courrouce "poinct, quand on lui faict sentir que vous l'aymez." What she actually said on these and two other occasions, they have intrusted to the bearer; for the roads are so insecure in France, and the art of deciphering is become so common, that they will not commit it to paper.—Ibid. 305, 322, 330, 335, 345, 353. At their sug-

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1591. April 6.

cates at the English court,—the earl of Essex, the secretary Walsingham, and the lord admiral Howard; but Essex was not of the cabinet; Walsingham died in the spring of the year; and the influence of Howard was neutralized by the cautious and calculating policy of Burghley, of whose authority the French ambassadors write that, if the queen were to order one thing, and the lord treasurer another, the latter would be obeyed.[1] It was not that Elizabeth or her minister was indifferent to the result of the civil war in France; but *he* looked upon its continuance as a benefit, because it exhausted the resources of a power naturally hostile to England, and *she* was always ready to listen to counsels which favoured her habits of parsimony. Now, however, that a Spanish force was actually lodged on the coast of Bretagne, both became alarmed. A loan of money was reluctantly advanced; leave to export ammunition was granted; and a subsidiary army of three thousand men was levied.[2] Essex solicited the command; he urged his request for hours at a time on his knees, at the feet of the queen. But Elizabeth had the resolution to refuse; and by the advice of Burghley conferred that important trust on Sir John Norris, an old and experienced officer.[3] With his aid the royalists in Bretagne kept the Spaniards in check; but Henry demanded additional assistance; and the prospect of the reduction of Rouen obtained for him the tardy consent of Elizabeth. Essex again came forward; the king seconded

Jan. 7.

gestion she worked a scarf, and sent it to Henry as a present.—Egert. 359, 365, 413.

[1] Ibid. 357, 359.

[2] Ibid. 384.

[3] Ibid. 384, 385. Essex, to show his displeasure, left the court.—Ibid. 388.

his suit; and the favourite triumphed at last over the opposition of the minister, and was not displeased, on assuming the command, that Shirley and Wilkes, whom the queen had selected for his military advisers, declined the unwelcome task.[1] He landed at Dieppe with three hundred lances, three thousand infantry, and three hundred gentlemen volunteers. But Henry was detained in the distant province of Champagne; and the English force remained for two months inactive in the camp at Arques; where Essex conferred the honour of knighthood on many of his followers to console the disappointment of those who had expected to win their spurs in the field. At last the king entered Normandy; a reinforcement was asked for and obtained from England; and a blockade was established round Rouen during the winter, in which the English suffered severely from the inclemency of the weather, and from skirmishes with the enemy. On the return of spring the siege was raised at the approach of the duke of Parma; and Essex, by order from the queen, left the small remnant of his force under the command of Sir Roger Williams. The result of each succeeding campaign was similar. Year after year a subsidiary force sailed from England, too inconsiderable to do more than create a diversion for the moment; in a few months it dwindled away through disease and the casualties of war; and the loss was subsequently repaired by the transmission of other petty reinforcements. The truth is, that Henry and Elizabeth were playing a

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1591. — August 1. 1592. April 10.

[1] Rym. xvi. 98. Egert. 415. "In my judgment, my lord of "Essex will have his will, he is so fully bent to perform it."—Lee to Lord Shrewsbury, June 20th. "I have not known so gallant a "troop go out of England with so many young and untrained com- "manders."—Syd. Pap. i. 327.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1592.

similar game, each seeking to derive benefit from the embarrassments of the other. If the queen reluctantly acceded to the repeated requests of the king, it was chiefly with the view of dislodging the Spaniards from Bretagne; and if Henry never scrupled to break his engagements to her, it was because he knew that the presence of a Spanish force so near her own shore would act as a stimulus on her parsimony, and, notwithstanding her disappointment and vexation, compel her to aid him with men and money and ammunition.[1]

The state papers of the time, which are still extant in considerable numbers, show the restless and irritable condition of the royal mind during this succession of disappointments. The queen's resolves were perpetually changing; nothing that was done could please her; she reprimanded and threatened her ministers at home and her agents abroad, her favourite Essex and Unton her ambassador.[2] But the conduct of the king of France, his apparent indifference to her interests and wishes, and his vexatious demands of additional aid in reply to every complaint, furnished the severest trial to her patience. Aware that she dared not show her resentment, he laughed in secret at her menaces. When he ascended the throne, he had given his word that he would study the grounds of the ancient

[1] See Rymer, xvi. passim; Murdin, 644—653. Elizabeth ordered the university of Oxford to choose Lord Buckhurst chancellor, in opposition to Essex. The latter thus expresses his vexation: "If I die (in the assault), pity not me, for I shall die with more "pleasure than I live with; if I escape, comfort me not, for the "queen's wrong and unkindness is too great."—Ibid. 650. Roan, 23rd of December.

[2] See Rymer, xvi. from the beginning to p. 200; also Murdin, 644—653; Birch, Negotiations, 1—14.

faith. To the reformed ministers this promise proved a source of alarm and scandal; it was ridiculed by the courtiers, and was considered by the English queen as a mere evasion. But experience convinced Henry that he must redeem his pledge, if he meant to reign in tranquillity. He assisted at several conferences between the Catholic prelates and the reformed divines; and, in 1593, announced his intention of conforming to the ancient worship. Burghley immediately composed for the queen a remonstrance, showing the disgrace and danger of such a step; Elizabeth added a letter in her own hand; but the messenger arrived too late; the ceremony of abjuration had already been performed; and the king returned an answer, apologizing for his conduct, and confirming his former assurances of gratitude and esteem. At the first shock the queen loudly charged him with perfidy and duplicity; but this burst of passion was succeeded by an unusual depression of spirits, from which she sought relief in the study of theology. She held frequent conferences with the archbishop; she spent much of her time in reading the Scriptures; and she consulted the writings of the ancient fathers. But, though she might thus confirm her own faith, she dared not blame the apostasy of Henry. Policy demanded that, since they were no longer bound to each other by the profession of the same religion, she should secure his friendship by some other tie. A negotiation ensued; and a treaty was concluded at Melun, by which both princes obliged themselves to maintain an offensive and defensive war against Philip, as long as Philip should remain at war with either party.[1]

1593. July 15.

[1] Camden, 661—665. Elizabeth's letter is in Hearne's Notes,

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1593.

The public mind was now agitated by rumours of plots against the life of the queen. The death of Mary Stuart had not, as she anticipated, secured her from danger; it made her appear to foreign nations as an usurper who, to secure herself on the throne, had shed the blood of the true heir; their prejudice against her was augmented by the continued execution of the Catholic missionaries, the narratives of their sufferings, and the prints representing the manner of their punishment;[1] and there were not wanting man of heated imaginations, who persuaded themselves that they should render a service to mankind by the removal of a woman who appeared to them in the light of a sanguinary and unprincipled tyrant.[2] That such projects were sometimes entertained, we can hardly doubt, after the several convictions which took place; and yet it is extremely difficult to fix on any one particular instance in which the guilt of the accused appears to have been fairly proved. The truth is, that both Elizabeth and Philip employed multitudes of spies, men of ruined fortunes and unprincipled minds. These, in general, whether it was for greater security or additional emolument, contrived to enter into the service of both princes; and if they were afterwards charged

p. 927. It ends thus: "Vostre asseurée soeur, si ce soit a la vielle "monde; avecque la novelle je n'ay que faire. E. R."

[1] See note (BB) at the end.

[2] Persons informs us that he himself had dissuaded some individuals, and particularly one, who, "for delivering of Catholique "people from persecution, had resolved to luse his own life, or to "take away that of her majestie." He had already proceeded more than one hundred miles on his journey, when Persons met him, and after much reasoning prevailed on him to lay aside the project, chiefly on the ground that "the English Catholiques themselves desired not to be delivered from their miseries by any such "attempt."—Persons, Wardword, 71.

with duplicity by either, sheltered themselves under the plea, that such conduct enabled them to discover and betray the secret counsels of the adverse party. To satisfy their employers, they were often compelled to transmit false and alarming intelligence; sometimes they actually formed conspiracies, that they might have the merit of detecting them; and not unfrequently meeting with associates as abandoned as themselves, they perished in the very snares which they had laid for others. Hence it happened that both the English and Spanish courts were prepared to believe the existence of plots against the lives of their respective sovereigns, and that both Philip and Elizabeth, under the influence of such belief, charged each other with the guilt of intended assassination.[1]

In the art of detecting the objects, and directing the practices, of such spies and conspirators, Walsingham was unrivalled. After his death, that office was assumed by Lord Burghley, who, aware that in personal attractions he must yield to most of his competitors in the cabinet, sought to maintain his place in the royal estimation by his superior attention to the safety of his sovereign. Essex, indeed, spent considerable sums in the entertainment of spies upon the continent; yet it constantly happened that his information was anticipated by the industry of Burghley,[2] till he obtained the aid of Antonio Perez, once the favourite secretary of Philip, now a refugee in England from the justice or vengeance of his master. Elizabeth, looking on the Spaniard as a traitor, refused

[1] Camden, 691. There are among the records at Simancas several notices sent to Philip, of plots to assassinate him. Probably both that prince and Elizabeth attributed to each other projects of which they were equally incapable.

[2] Relig. Watton, p. 187, 188, edit. 1685.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1593

him an audience; and Burghley, imitating his sovereign, never spoke with him more than once; but Essex, less scrupulous, admitted his visits, and received from him a hint that Roderigo Lopez, a Jew and a physician, who had been made prisoner in 1558, and had ever since, on account of his skill, been retained in the royal service, was a secret pensioner of the Spanish monarch. Elizabeth would not believe the charge; she allowed, however, her favourite to investigate the matter, joining in commission with him Lord Burghley, and his son, Sir Robert Cecil. All three proceeded to the house of Lopez. They interrogated the Jew, seized and examined his papers, and made every possible inquiry. The result was a conviction in the minds of the Cecils that he was innocent. Elizabeth sharply reprimanded her favourite, who, returning to his house, refused to leave his chamber, till by repeated messages and apologies she had "atoned" for the affront. Stimulated by vexation and the hope of mortifying the Cecils, he resumed the inquiry; and with much labour made out a probable charge of high treason against Lopez, and two Portuguese followers of Don Antonio, called Ferreira and Louis. Ferreira confessed, that by direction of the Jew he had written a letter to Fuentes and Ibarra, the Spanish ministers in the Low Countries, offering to poison the queen for a reward of fifty thousand crowns; and Louis, that he had been commissioned by the same ministers to come to England and urge Lopez to the execution of his promise. How far these confessions, made in the Tower, and probably on the rack, are deserving of credit, may be doubted. Letters were certainly intercepted, which proved the existence of a plot to set fire to the fleet; and the

1594. Jan. 28.

Jew himself acknowledged that he had occasionally received presents from the Spanish court, and had in return made general offers of service; but he denied that he had ever done, or meant to do, anything prejudicial to the person of the queen; and it may be observed, as some confirmation of his statement, that on one occasion he had shown her a valuable ring which he had received, and put to her the question, whether it were not allowed him "to deceive the "deceiver." All three on their trials were found guilty; but judgment was respited during three months, in the hope that they would make further discoveries.[1] After the execution of Lopez and Louis, the queen wrote to the archduke Ernest, the new governor of Flanders, requesting a passport for a gentleman who would inform him of the desperate practices of Fuentes and Ibarra, and would demand the surrender of her traitorous subjects, Owen, Throckmorton, Holt the Jesuit, and Worthington and Gifford, professors of theology. The archduke complied, but with so little ceremony, that the pride of Elizabeth was offended, and the passport was returned.[2]

Feb. 28.

June 7.

The king of France, in compliance with an article

[1] On the treason of Lopez, see Camden, 676, 677; Birch, i. 149—152, 156—160; Murdin, 669; Bacon's Works, ii. 106, edition of 1802. Bacon wrote his account at the desire of his patron, the earl of Essex. Two letters had been obtained, brought by Louis from Fuentes and Ibarra. It was difficult to discover their real meaning. By these ministers it was pretended that they referred to an intrigue which Walsingham, who was dead, had carried on with some of the secretaries to the Spanish council; but Louis was induced to refer them to the assassination of the queen.—Birch, i. 156. Murdin, 680. I cannot explain how it happens that both Camden, 677, and Stowe, 768, relate the execution of Ferreira; though he appears to have been saved by the favour of Essex, whom he accompanied to Cadiz, and to whom he afterwards presented a memorial, to be seen in Birch, ii. 268.

[2] Compare Camden, 677, with a letter in Birch, Negotiations, 15.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1594.

in the late treaty, had declared war against Spain. He had soon reason to doubt the policy, and repent of the precipitancy, of the measure. Velasco, constable of Castile, entered Champagne, and threatened Franche-Comté. Fuentes penetrated into Picardy, dispersed the French army, carried Dourlens by storm, and obtained possession of the important city of Cambray. It was in vain that Henry called on Elizabeth for aid. She anticipated a second attempt at invasion on the part of Philip, recalled her troops from the defence of Bretagne, openly condemned herself of folly, in having expended so much money and lost so many valuable lives in France; and, if at last she appeared to relent, she still demanded the previous possession of Calais, as a security or indemnity for the charges of the war. Henry rejected the proposal with scorn; but at the same time admonished her that he was unable to continue the war without aid; that his people clamorously demanded a peace; and that, if she abandoned him in his necessities, he should be compelled to throw himself into the arms of Spain.[1]

[1] Consult the correspondence on this subject in Birch, Negotiations, 26—36; and in Murdin, 701—734. Henry, to subdue her obstinacy, made a singular appeal to her vanity. Unton, the ambassador (probably the farce was concerted between them) wrote to her that one day the king asked him how he liked his mistress, La belle Gabrielle. "I answered," says Unton, "sparingly in her "praise, and told him that, if without offence I might speak it, I "had a picture of a far more excellent mistress, and yet did her "picture come far short of her perfection of beauty." The reader will recollect that Elizabeth was only in her sixty-third year. Unton now showed it to the king. "He beheld it with passion and "admiration; saying that I had reason.—*Je me rends;* protesting "that he had never seen the like. He kissed it, took it from me, "vowing that he would not forego it for any treasure; and that, to "possess the favour of the lively picture, he would forsake all the "world." They then began to talk upon business; "but I found," adds the ambassador, "that the dumb picture did draw on more "speech and affection from him, than all my best arguments and

The reports of the preparations in the harbours of the peninsula had excited a general alarm throughout England. It was evident that the failure of the first expedition had partly been owing to accident and the weather; a more favourable season might enable a second armada to land an army on the coast; and a contest between new levies, however brave, and a veteran force, inured to victory, could not be contemplated without apprehension for the result. Every precaution was taken; fortifications were erected; ships were commissioned; troops were levied in the different counties; and all recusants and suspected persons were compelled to deliver up their arms, and to remove from free, as it was called, into close custody.[1] In the meantime the archduke Albert, cardinal of Austria, who had succeeded to the government of the Spanish Netherlands, under the pretence of raising the siege of La Fere, by a sudden and unexpected march, sat down with fifteen thousand men before Calais. The adjoining forts were soon won; the town itself, after an armistice of eight days, surrendered; and the garrison retiring into the citadel, maintained a brave but hopeless resistance. This unlooked-for event perplexed Elizabeth. She ordered the lord mayor to impress one thousand men as an immediate reinforcement; the next morning she re-

March 29.

April 9.

"eloquence."—Murdin, 718, 719. Elizabeth was proud, or pretended to be proud, of these compliments to her beauty. She sent, probably in consequence of this letter, her portrait as a present to Henry's sister; but the king received a hint from Lord Sheffield to keep it for himself. He did so, and wrote to her that he was sure she meant it in reality for him, and that it had given him such a notion of her beauty that he could not prevail on himself to part with it.—Egerton, 415.

[1] "These Spanish preparations, I assure your lordship, doth "breed incredible fears in the mynds of most men."—Sydney Papers, i. 355, 356.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596.

voked the order; the day after she renewed it. But the French envoys observed that the urgency of the case admitted of no delay; a strong detachment might be sent from the army already embodied; or the English fleet might make its appearance at the mouth of the harbour. She interrupted them to ask whether, if she preserved the place, Henry would put it, or Boulogne, into her hands. They replied that they had no instructions on that head. In fact, Sir Robert Sydney had been already sent to make the proposal. But the king, turning his back on the messenger, indignantly replied that he would rather submit to a box on the ear from a man, than to a fillip from a woman.[1] In a few days the citadel was taken by storm; the French charged the queen with duplicity, in raising expectations which she had refused to fulfil; and Elizabeth herself beheld with regret the establishment of the Spaniards in a port which offered additional facilities to the invasion of England.[2]

April 14.

In these circumstances Henry applied again to the queen for assistance, and by his ambassadors proposed an alliance offensive and defensive of all the powers whose interests were endangered by the ambition of Philip. The lord-treasurer required, as an indispensable condition, that the king should be bound never to make peace with the common enemy without the concurrence of his allies; and to this the French negotiators assented, but contrived to introduce into another part of the treaty a provision, under the cover of which they trusted that Henry might, if he pleased,

April 26.

[1] "Qu'il aimoit mieux recevoir un soufflet du roy d'Espagne "qu'une chiquenaude d'elle."—Du Vair, apud Egerton, 35.

[2] Camden, 719. Stowe, 769. Birch, i. 463, 465. Daniel, xii. 244, and a great number of papers in Rymer, tom. xv.

escape from the obligation.[1] Nor was that the only deception practised on the occasion. The amount of the auxiliary force to be supplied to the party originally at war had been fixed at four thousand men; and under this form the provision was communicated to the States, who immediately acceded to it; but at the same time, by a secret article, the number was cut down in favour of the English queen from four to two thousand, and these were to be employed, not in the field, but in garrison duty at Boulogne and Montreuil. This was the utmost that the ambassadors could obtain from the queen, whose attention was now directed to objects more closely connected with her own safety.

1. Elizabeth had recently become acquainted with the failure of the expedition to the West Indies, undertaken by Hawkins and Drake. The Spanish settlements in the New World were no longer in that defenceless condition in which they had formerly been found. Wherever the English landed, they were bravely opposed; if they inflicted injury, they received equal injury in return; the two commanders died under the anxiety of their minds and the rigour of the service; and the survivors returned without glory, and what, perhaps, was equally distressing to

[1] Du Vair mentions with much self-complacency his own adroitness in slipping in ("fit glisser") two articles, the object of which the simplicity of the English council did not discover. They were, that if one party failed to perform his obligation by the appointed time, the other should be free, and that the ratifications should be exchanged within six months. Henry seems to have taken the benefit of the latter; for the date of the treaty is April 26; and Elizabeth swore to its observance on the 29th of August; but Henry waited for more than seven months, till the 21st of December.—Egerton, 293, 407. Camd. 730.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596.

the queen, without plunder to repay the expenses of the expedition.[1]

2. The hostile preparations in the Spanish harbours excited considerable alarm; and for several weeks the defence of the realm had been the subject of daily deliberation in the council. Howard of Effingham, the lord admiral, urged the same measure which he had proposed on the former occasion,—to anticipate the design of the enemy by sending out an expedition to destroy his ports, shipping, and magazines. He was powerfully seconded by Essex, who despised the cautious policy of Burghley, and by his influence, after a long struggle, obtained the consent of the

March 18.

queen. She gave him the command of the land, while the lord admiral held that of the naval force; but, to restrain his impetuosity, he was ordered to ask the advice of a council of war, and to be guided by the opinion of the majority. The members were, besides the two commanders in chief, the lord Thomas Howard and Sir Walter Raleigh for the naval, Sir Francis Vere, Sir George Carew, and Sir Coniers Clifford for the land service.[2]

[1] Camden, 699—701.

[2] Ibid. 721. Sir Walter Raleigh, in 1591, had debauched Elizabeth Throckmorton, one of the maids of honour, and for this offence was, in July following, committed to the custody of Sir G. Carew. From the window he saw the queen's barge on the Thames, and pretended to become frantic at the sight. He suffered, he said, all the horrors of Tantalus; he would go on the water and see his mistress. Sir George interfered; a struggle ensued; Raleigh tore off his keeper's new periwig; and both drew their daggers before they were parted.—See a letter of July 26, in the new edition of Shakespeare, App. 577. As this adventure did not move the queen, he had recourse to another expedient. She was going on her progress. "How," he asked, "could he live alone in prison, while "she was far off? He was wont to behold her riding like Alexan- "der, hunting like Diana, walking like Venus, the gentle wind

After much irresolution, and considerable delay, occasioned partly by the disguised opposition of the Cecils, and partly by the inconstant humour of the queen, the expedition left the harbour of Plymouth. By the junction of twenty-two ships from Holland, it amounted to one hundred and fifty sail, and carried fourteen thousand men, of whom one thousand or fifteen hundred were gentlemen volunteers.[1] At the end of three weeks the fleet cast anchor at the mouth of the haven of Cadiz, in which were discovered fifteen men-of-war and about forty merchantmen. At seven the next morning, the English, in defiance of the fire from the forts and batteries, entered the harbour; the Spaniards met their foes with determined courage; and for some hours the action was maintained on both sides with equal obstinacy. But

June 1.

June 20.

"blowing her fair hair about her pure cheeks like a nymph, some-"times sitting in the shade like a goddess, sometimes singing like "an angel, sometimes playing like Orpheus. But once amiss had "bereaved him of all." He then exclaims, "All those times past, "the loves, the sighs, the sorrows, the desires, can they not weigh "down one frail misfortune? Cannot one drop of gall be hidden "under such heaps of sweetness?"—Letter to Cecil in Murdin, 657. But this flattery did not atone for his presumption or infidelity. He was confined in the Tower two months, and at his discharge in September forbidden to come near the court; nor could he, till after his return from the expedition to Cadiz, obtain leave to resume his office of captain of the guard.—Camden, 697. Birch, ii. 345.

[1] The queen composed two prayers, one for her own use, the other to be daily used in the fleet during the expedition.—Camden, 721. The former may be seen in Birch, ii. 18, with a letter to Essex from Sir Robert Cecil, who, in a tone of the most fulsome flattery, observes, "No prayer is so fruitful as that which proceedeth "from those who nearest in nature and power approach the "Almighty. None so near approach his place and essence, as a "celestial mind in a princely body. Put forth, therefore, my lord, "with comfort and confidence, having your sails filled with her "heavenly breath for your forewind."—Ibid. Lord Burghley also composed a prayer, and printed it for the use of the public. It is in Strype, iv. 262.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596.

about one in the afternoon the enemy attempted to run their ships ashore, and set them on fire. Two of the largest, the St. Matthew and St. Andrew, with an argosy, were taken; the galleys effected their escape by sea; and the merchantmen, that had proceeded to Port Royal during the action, having discharged their cargoes, were burnt by order of the duke of Medina Sidonia.

Within an hour from the termination of the engagement by sea, the earl of Essex, with his wonted promptitude, had landed three thousand men at Puntal, and marched with fifteen hundred in the direction of the city. A small body of horse and foot threatened opposition; but they fell back as he advanced; and finding the gate shut against them, made their way over a ruinous part of the wall. Essex followed at their heels; the enemy kept up a destructive fire from the houses; but he advanced as far as the market-place, where he was joined by the lord admiral and another party that had entered by a portal. Resistance was now at

June 22.

an end; and early the next morning a capitulation was signed, by which the inhabitants paid a ransom of one hundred and twenty thousand crowns for their lives; and the town, the merchandize, and every kind of property, were abandoned to the rapacity of the conquerors.[1]

[1] "The town of Cales was very rich in merchandize, in plate, "and money; many rich prisoners given to the land commanders, "so as that sort are very rich. Some had prisoners for 16,000 "ducats, some for 20,000, some for 10,000; and beside, great "houses of merchandize. What the generals have gotten I know "lest; they protest it is little. For my own part, I have gotten a "lame leg, and a deformed. For the rest, either I spake too late, "or it was otherwise resolved. I have not wanted good words, and "exceeding kind and regardful usance; but I have possession of "nought but poverty and pain."—Raleigh apud Cayley, i. 272.

The commanders met in council to deliberate on their future proceedings. Essex proposed to march with the army into the heart of Andalusia; and, when that was rejected, offered to remain in the isle with three or four thousand men, and to defend it against all the power of the enemy.[1] There was, in both of these plans, less of real than of apparent danger. Spain had been drained of its disciplined forces; the nobles were discontented at their exclusion from the offices of the government; the people in several provinces had manifested a disposition to revolt; and the Moriscoes would have cheerfully joined the banners of the strangers.[2] But the majority of the council opposed every suggestion offered by the earl; the town, with the exception of the churches, was reduced to ashes; and the troops, taking with them the most valuable portion of the plunder, re-embarked. At sea the same dissension prevailed among the leaders; and after many altercations, and two unimportant descents on the Spanish coast, the fleet returned to Plymouth about ten weeks after its departure.[3]

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596. — July 5. August 10.

Never before had the Spanish monarch received so severe a blow. He lost thirteen men-of-war and immense magazines of provisions and naval stores; the defences of Cadiz, the strongest fortress in his dominions, had been razed to the ground; and the secret of his weakness at home had been revealed

[1] Essex in his apology, Birch, ii. 58.

[2] Hawkins from Venice, August 20, apud Birch, ii. 112. Lettres d'Ossat, i. 301.

[3] We have several accounts from different persons employed in the expedition, in Birch ii. 46—58. See also Camden, 720—728; Stowe, 770—776: Strype, iv. 286—288; and Raleigh's Works, viii. 671.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596.

to the world, at the same time that the power of England had been raised in the eyes of the European nations. Even those who wished well to Spain allotted the praise of moderation and humanity to the English commanders, who had suffered no blood to be wantonly spilt, no woman to be defiled, but had sent under an escort the nuns and females, about three thousand in number, to the port of St. Mary, and had allowed them to carry away their jewels and wearing apparel.[1] But while foreigners applauded the conquerors, while their countrymen hailed their return with shouts of triumph, they experienced from their sovereign a cool and ungracious reception.

From the first introduction of Essex at court, Burghley had looked on him with a jealous eye. Age and infirmity admonished that statesman that it was time for him to retire; and he naturally sought to bequeath his place and his influence in the council to his son, Sir Robert Cecil. Aware that Essex might prove a dangerous competitor, he maintained towards him the external forms of friendship, while he secretly endeavoured to undermine his influence; and the queen, perhaps to show that she was not governed by her young favourite, often listened to the suggestions of his opponents; and, though she generally granted his petitions for himself, uniformly refused the favours which he solicited for his dependants. In 1590 Walsingham died; to supply his place Burghley proposed his son Robert; Essex, first the unfortunate Davison, and afterwards Sir Thomas Bodley. Elizabeth, under the pretence of preserving peace between

[1] Birch, ii. 125. Strype, iv. 287. They must, however, share this praise with the queen, who had strictly bound them to such conduct by her instructions.—Camden, 721.

the parties, refused to make any appointment; but desired Burghley to take the office provisionally on himself, and at his request allowed him to employ his son as an assistant.[1] The object of "the old fox" (so Essex was accustomed to call him) was manifest; yet for six years the earl had sufficient credit to retard the appointment of Sir Robert. Soon, however, after the departure of the fleet, Elizabeth signed a warrant in his favour; and the courtiers, predicting the ascendancy of the Cecils, sought to instil into the royal ear suspicions and misgivings respecting the conduct of the absent favourite. His gallantries and debaucheries, his presumption and obstinacy, his extravagance and irritability, were exaggerated, and hypocritically lamented. They made light of the capture of Cadiz. It was a cheap and easy conquest; the only resistance had been made by sea; and there the whole merit belonged to Sir Walter Raleigh. How far they might have persuaded the queen, is uncertain; but when she learned that the plunder, instead of being preserved for the treasury, had been divided among the adventurers, her avarice convinced her of the misconduct of Essex, and she was heard to declare that, if she had hitherto done his pleasure, she would now teach him to do hers.[2]

On their return to Plymouth, the two commanders in chief received an extraordinary message. The expedition, they were told, had already cost the queen fifty thousand pounds; *she* would be at no further expense; it was for *them*, who knew what was become

[1] Burghley entertained the queen at a great expense, at Theobald's, where she knighted his son (May 20, 1591), and soon afterwards (August 2) ordered him to be sworn of the privy council.—Sydney Pap. i. 312, 326, 329. Murdin, 796, 797.

[2] Birch, ii. 96, 100. Sydney Papers, i. 348.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596. — August 11.

of the plunder, to provide funds for the payment of the mariners and soldiers.[1] The earl immediately hastened to court; but, aware of the unfavourable reports made to the queen, he assumed a new character,—that of a saint. He was no longer the gay and voluptuous Essex. He became grave and sedate; those who had been scandalized by the publicity of his amours were surprised at the attentions which he exclusively lavished on his countess; and his constant appearance at church, his devout demeanour at sermons and prayers, edified, perhaps amused, his former companions.[2] The queen reluctantly betrayed her satisfaction at the return of her favourite; but she obstinately refused to listen to his justification in private. He was compelled, day after day, to appear before her in council, and to answer to every article. He contended that he and his colleague had done whatever it was in their power to do; that they had brought home for the queen two galleons, and more than one hundred pieces of brass ordnance; that, if she had not received her share of the plunder, she must look for indemnification to the commissioners appointed by the lord treasurer, who, though often admonished, had neglected to perform their duty;[3] and that for himself, he had on every occasion been thwarted by his colleagues in the council, and the creatures of the Cecils, who had even opposed his proposal to sail to Tercera, and intercept the treasure of the Spanish king on its way from the Indies. While the cause was yet pending, advice was received that this fleet, with twenty millions of dollars on board, had arrived in the ports of Spain. The queen's indignation was instantly

Sept. 4.

[1] Birch, ii. 93. [2] Ibid. 116, 122. [3] Ibid. ii. 131, 141.

pointed against his adversaries and their patrons; every man hastened to seek a reconciliation with the accused; and even Burghley himself, who had formerly suggested to Elizabeth that the ransom paid by the inhabitants belonged to the crown, now supported Essex in opposition to her claim. This apostasy of the treasurer threw the queen into a paroxysm of rage; she called him "a miscreant and a coward, "more afraid of Essex than of herself," and poured on him such a torrent of abuse, that he retired home in despair, and talked "of obtaining license to live "as an anchorite, as fittest for his age, his infirmities, "and his declining influence at court."[1] CHAP. VIII. A. D. 1596. Sept. 22.

It would weary the patience of the reader to attend to the continual dissensions between these rival statesmen. The queen preferred Sir Robert Cecil as a man of business, Essex as an agreeable companion. The former was industrious and intelligent, a master in the art of flattery, and always ready to sacrifice his own opinion to the superior, or, as he termed it, "the divine "judgment of his sovereign."[2] But Essex was petulant and obstinate; when he could not prevail by argument or entreaty, he reproached the queen with unkindness, retired from the court, and confined himself to his bed, under pretence of indisposition; and though Elizabeth repeatedly resolved to break his spirit, she as repeatedly submitted to his pleasure, under the idle fear of breaking his heart. There was, moreover, another point, in which he was in danger of forfeiting the royal favour. The worldly refused him credit for that superior sanctity which he affected;

[1] Birch, 146—148. "He hath made the old fox to crouch and "whine."—Ibid. 153.
[2] Ibid. Negotiations, 152.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596.

and the scandal of the court had marked him out, perhaps unjustly, for the favoured lover of a married lady of high rank.[1] With the reputation of other women the queen had little concern; but to watch over the conduct of the young females employed about her person was a duty which she owed both to herself and to their parents. Among her maids of honour was a lady called Bridges, to whom the palm of superior beauty had been assigned by common consent. She quickly attracted the notice of Essex; his attentions flattered her vanity, perhaps won her affections; and the tale of her indiscretion was soon whispered in the royal ear. Elizabeth sent for Bridges, with her companion Russell, convinced the culprit of her displeasure by the infliction of manual chastisement, and ordered both to be discharged with ignominy from her service. For three nights the house of Lady Stafford afforded them an asylum; at length, having asked pardon, and promised amendment, they were restored to favour.[2]

1597. April 10.

A stop was put to these courtly broils by the news received from Spain. For eight years Philip, though he might threaten, had literally done nothing against England. He appeared to sleep over the war, till the blow received at Cadiz awakened him from his apathy. Now he publicly vowed revenge; the fleet from the Indies had replenished his treasury; his people offered him an abundant supply of money;

[1] See Lady Bacon's letter to him on his "backsliding," and his answer, ibid. 218—220.

[2] The cause of the queen's displeasure was given out to be "their "taking of physic, and one day going privately through the privy "galleries to see the playing at ballon."—Sydney Papers, ii. 38. He adds, "you may conjecture whence these storms arise."—Ibid.

and he ordered the Adelantado of Castile to prepare a second armada for the invasion of England. He even indulged a hope that if success attended the expedition, his daughter, the infanta of Spain, might be placed on the English throne.[1]

3. To understand this visionary project, the reader must go back to the divisions which prevailed among the Catholic exiles previously to the death of Mary Stuart. The fate of that princess, which was certainly, though unintentionally, occasioned by the vindictive intrigues of Morgan, Paget, and their associates, confirmed the ascendant which their adversaries had already acquired in the different Catholic courts. They, however, did not yield without a struggle. They loudly complained that the ambition of the Jesuits had monopolized the business of the nation; they maintained that secular affairs did not belong to religious bodies; they sent agents of their own to most of the catholic princes; they sought to undermine the influence of Persons at the court of Madrid, to prevent the promotion of Allen, and afterwards to balance his influence by procuring a cardinal's hat for their own associate, Louis, bishop of Cassano.[2] But every plan was defeated by the superior address or superior influence of their opponents, who were distinguished by the appellation of the Spanish party. Allen was its nominal, Persons its effective head; their principal associates were the Jesuits Cresswell and Holt, Sir Francis Englefield, Sir Francis Stanley, Owen, and Fitzherbert. The great object of the party was the restoration of the Catholic worship in England under the sway of a

[1] Padilla's commission is in Strype, iv. 316.
[2] Persons, Briefe Apology, 5, 6, 31, 36.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1597.

Catholic sovereign, whom both gratitude and interest induced them to seek in the royal house of Spain. The jealousy of Elizabeth and the prohibitory statute had closed the mouths of men with respect to the succession;[1] but it was highly probable that at her death a number of competitors would start for the throne; and the exiles in general entertained an opinion that Burghley would support, with all his influence, the claim of Arabella Stuart, to whose hand his son, Sir Robert, was already said to aspire. To defeat this supposed purpose, to awaken the public attention, and to prepare the way for the daughter of Philip, they published the celebrated tract, entitled, "A Conference about the next Succession to the Crown of England, had in 1593, by R. Doleman."[2] This work, the production of different pens, was said to have been revised and edited by Persons.[3] In the first part, it undertakes

[1] "A law being made that no man, under pain of treason, should talke or reason of the next successor to the crowne, so great an ignorance grew thereby into the people's heades and heartes, of that thing which most of all (next after God) imported them to know, and which one day must be tryed by the uttermost adventure of goods, life, and soule, as it seemed most needful to prevent in part so great a mischief, and to let them see and heare at least, what and how many there were, that did or might pretend to the same."—Persons to the earl of Angus, apud Plowden, Remarks on Memoirs of Panzani, 357.

[2] The book was dedicated to the Earl of Essex in 1595. with such praise of his many virtues, that the jealousy of the queen was excited. What passed between them on the subject is not known; but on the 3rd of November it was observed that when he left her he looked pale and pensive. On his arrival at his own house, he seemed much indisposed; and, though the queen visited him the next day, kept his bed till the 12th.—Sydney Papers, i. 350, 357, 359.

[3] But, says the French minister, "Il est certain que ce livre qui court contre le dit Roi et la succession sous le nom de Persons, n'a oncques eté fait par ce Jésuite, et que l'on a empruntè son nom exprès pour irriter ledit Roi contre lui et contre ceux de son

to prove that, as the right of succession is regulated not by divine but by positive laws, which are not immutable, but must vary with circumstances, the profession of a false religion is in all cases a sufficient bar against propinquity of blood; in the second it enumerates the different persons who, on account of their descent from the royal family of England, may advance any pretensions to the crown after the death of the queen; but, though it professes to state all the arguments for and against their respective claims with the most perfect impartiality, it continually betrays a strong leaning towards the pretended right of the infanta, as the lineal representative of John of Ghent, son of Edward III.[1] This tract excited an extraordinary sensation both in England and on the continent; it alarmed and irritated the queen and her ministers; and it flattered the pride of Philip, who, at the persuasion of Persons, had consented to renounce his own pretensions, with the vain hope of seeing his daughter seated on the English throne. He offered the command of the expedition to the Adelantado of Castile, who proposed and obtained his own terms; an emissary hastened to England to sound the disposition of the earl of Essex; and the exiles, in their secret councils, formed dif-

"ordre."—Villeroy in La Boderie, iii. 142. Villeroy was, however, imposed upon; and Mr. Tierney (in Dodd, iii. 31, note) has proved that Persons was the principal writer of the book. It was partly reprinted under the title of "Several Speeches made at a "conference concerning the power of parliaments to proceed against "their king for misgovernment" (Lond. 1648), of which Charles I. greatly complained, and to which Bradshaw was indebted for his speech at the condemnation of the same king. Afterwards it supplied materials for most of the publications against the succession of James, duke of York, in the reign of Charles II., especially for "The great and weighty Considerations relating to the Duke of "York as Successor to the Crown." Lond. 1680.

[1] Camden, 672.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1597.

ferent plans to promote the success of the projected invasion, and to facilitate the accession of their imaginary queen.[1]

But the preparations of Philip, and the views of the party, were carefully communicated to the English council by secret agents in the Spanish court. After some struggle the economy of Elizabeth yielded to her fears and the remonstrances of her advisers. She consented that a powerful armament should be fitted out for the destruction of the Spanish fleet; and gave the command to Essex, with the Lord Thomas Howard and Sir Walter Raleigh for his seconds. On his arrival at Plymouth, he found a fleet of one hundred and forty sail, and an army of eight thousand soldiers, waiting his command. He was no longer fettered with a council of war; the Cecils, he persuaded himself, had become his friends; and he saw nothing before him but a harvest of victory and glory. Unfortunately the weather was adverse; his impatience lamented the delay; the queen's parsimony the additional expense. To remove the cause, both had recourse to prayer; the wind came round to the north-east; and the humble mind of Elizabeth attributed the change to the more fervent devotion of her favourite.[2]

But Essex was destined to experience nothing but

[1] Birch, i. 304, 321; ii. 307.

[2] Letter of Knollys in Birch, ii. 351. She published her prayer for the use of her people. It is in that quaint obscure style which she affected, and which, to be understood by the majority of her subjects, ought to have been translated into ordinary language. It begins thus: "Oh God, almaker, keeper and guider, inurement of "thy rare-seen, unused, and seeld-heard-of goodness, poured in so "plentiful sort upon us full oft, breeds now this boldness to crave "thy large hand of helping power, to assist with wonder our just "cause, not founded on pride's motion, or begun on malice' stock." —Strype, iv. 316.

misfortune in this expedition. The fleet had not proceeded more than forty leagues, when it was driven back to port by a storm, which continued four days. With his usual obstinacy, the earl contended against the winds and waves, till his ship was a mere wreck. The gentlemen volunteers who accompanied him had seen enough of the naval service; on his return to Falmouth, most of them stole away to their homes.[1]

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1597.

July 11.

July 21.

To have refitted the fleet would have been to incur an expense to which the queen would not submit. Essex sailed again, but with a smaller force, and on a different destination. He reached the Azores; Fayal, Graciosa, and Flores submitted; but the Spanish fleet from the Indies, the real object of the expedition, had already escaped into the harbour of Tercera; and the English, with four inconsiderable prizes, and some plunder, directed their course to their own shores.[2] At the same time the Adelantado sailed from Ferrol with the intention of obtaining possession of the Isle of Wight, or of some strong post on the shore of Cornwall, which might be garrisoned and kept till the following spring, the season selected for the grand attempt. The two armaments, though at no very

Aug. 17.

Oct. 9.

[1] Camden, 738. Sydney Papers, 57. "I beat it up till my "ship was falling asunder, having a leak, that we pumped eight "tuns of water a day out of her; her main and foremast cracked, "and most of her beams broken and reft, besides the opening of all "her seams."—Birch, ii. 357.

[2] Camden, 740—744. Stowe, 783. Apology of the Earl of Essex, 15—19. Raleigh had attacked and taken Fayal without orders. Essex, who deemed the honour stolen from himself, received him with expressions of anger, and ordered several officers to be put under arrest. When he was advised to bring Raleigh to a court-martial, "I would," he replied, "had he been one of my "friends." The quarrel was hushed by the good offices of Lord Thomas Howard.—Camden, 741. Vere's Commentaries, 51. Sydney Papers, 74.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1597. Oct. 23.

great distance, proceeded in the same direction, unknown to each other. The Adelantado was already off the Scilly isles, when a storm arose. Both fleets were dispersed; but the English sought shelter in their own harbours; the Spaniards, compelled to keep at sea, suffered severely. Elizabeth at the first alarm had ordered forces to be raised, had sent for the two thousand men serving in France, and had summoned the lords to the defence of her person. But the elements again fought in her favour. The Spaniard, having collected his scattered fleet, shaped his course back to the Spanish coast, and in his return lost by a storm sixteen sail in the Bay of Biscay.[1]

From Plymouth the earl proceeded to court, and was received by Elizabeth with frowns and reproaches. He had done nothing to repay the expenses of the expedition, but had wasted her treasure, had disobeyed her instructions, and had insulted and oppressed Sir Walter Raleigh. He retired in discontent to his house at Wanstead, and for several weeks the business of the nation was interrupted by his complaints on the one hand, and by the ineffectual attempts of his sovereign to pacify him on the other. She condescended to acknowledge that every charge against him was unfounded; but he was not content. He demanded satisfaction for the imaginary wrongs which had been done to him during his absence. The chancellorship of the duchy of Lancaster, which he expected for one of his dependants, had been given to Sir Robert Cecil; the lord admiral had been created earl of Nottingham, and thus advanced by reason of office to precedency above him; and the praise of the

Oct. 8. Oct. 22.

[1] Sydney Papers, ii. 72—74. Camden, 744.

capture of Cadiz, which belonged to himself, was in the patent of creation attributed to the new earl. In his waywardness he offered to fight with that nobleman, or with any one of his sons, or with any gentleman of the name of Howard. At the queen's request the Cecils and Sir Walter Raleigh laboured to pacify this froward child; and, after a long negotiation, he accepted as an indemnity the appointment of earl marshal, because that office would give him precedence of the lord admiral. Nottingham immediately resigned the staff of lord steward, and retired from court.[1]

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1597

Dec. 18.

4. The anxiety of the Cecils to satisfy Essex was occasioned by a communication from the king of France. That prince sighed after peace. For thirteen years the realm had been torn by domestic and foreign wars; and, though the league of the Catholics was extinguished, another on the same principle had recently been formed by the Protestants. With peace abroad he might be able to guide the two parties at home; with war he foresaw that his kingdom must still be ravaged by religious dissensions. It happened that in the beginning of the year the Spaniards surprised the city of Amiens, with the large train of artillery and magazine of provisions within its walls. This stroke quite unnerved him. By Fouquerolles he solicited prompt and effectual aid of Elizabeth, offering, as security for the expense, to put Calais into her hands on its reduction by their joint exertions; and, at the same time, to work on her apprehensions, he assured her that, unless she would succour and save him, he must accept the services of

Feb. 24.

[1] Vere, 66. Sydney Papers, 70, 74, 75, 77. Birch, ii. 365. Camden, 746.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1597.

the pope, who had come forward as mediator between the two crowns. Fouquerolles argued and prayed in vain; and, if Henry delayed to sue immediately for peace, it was solely through the hope that some fortunate event might enable him to negotiate with greater dignity. In the month of September Amiens was recovered; and from that moment he resolved to sheathe the sword. Philip, weary of the war, and anxious to leave peaceable possession of his dominions to his successor, made no secret of his willingness to restore all his conquests; and, at the request of Henry, furnished the archduke with full power to treat, not only with him, but also with his allies.[1] The queen received the intelligence with displeasure; but unable to dissuade her French brother, she appointed Sir Robert Cecil ambassador extraordinary to the French court. That minister, aware from experience of the advantage to be derived from the absence of a rival, was unwilling to depart as long as Essex remained his enemy. It was therefore to win the friendship of the earl that he had advised his

1598. Jan. 21.

appointment to the office of earl marshal; to which was afterwards added a present of cochineal to the value of seven thousand pounds, and a contract for the sale of a much larger quantity out of the royal stores, by which he was likely to realize six times that sum. The earl knew that he owed the queen's liberality to the advice of the Cecils: he became their

Feb. 10.

friend; he transacted the business of secretary for Sir Robert, and faithfully watched over his interest during his absence.[2]

[1] Villeroy's report apud Egerton, 33, 34.

[2] "He hath given good security to pay the queen 50,000*l.* at 18*s.* "the pound for the cochineal; here it is sold for 30*s.* and some-

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1598. March 24.

After much intentional delay, the English ambassador was joined by the Dutch deputies at Angers; and both employed every expedient to divert the French monarch from the conclusion of peace.[1] The Hollanders urged the continuance of the war; Cecil had no proposals to offer; he came, so he pretended, for the sole purpose of ascertaining the sincerity of the Spanish ministers; all he could do was to return to England, and consult his sovereign; and for that purpose it was requisite that the conferences should be suspended for the space of some months. On the refusal of the king, he united with the allies in holding out the most tempting offers of aid, both in men and money, on condition that Henry should bind himself not to desert the confederacy; but, finding him inexorable, they had recourse to insinuations and reproaches; they charged him with ingratitude to the queen; they told him that on future occasions of distress he must not expect assistance from England. Henry heard them with patience. He acknowledged his obligations to Elizabeth, which he would never forget, though he was not ignorant that by aiding him she had protected herself. But he owed a duty to his people, from which gratitude to others could not excuse him. Peace was necessary to France; and peace, if it could be obtained, he was determined to have.[2] Sir

" times 40s."—Sydney Papers, 83. See p. 89, for their friendship. The writer adds:—" Yt is spied out by envy that the earle is again " fallen in love with his fairest Bridges. Yt cannot chuse but come " to the queen's ears; then he is undone, and all that depend on " his favour . . . the countess Essex suspects yt, and is greatly " disquiet."—Ibid. 90. How he escaped being undone, I know not.

[1] Sir Robert Cecil's train amounted to nearly two hundred persons.—Sydney Papers, ii. 96. His instructions are in Strype, iv. 451.

[2] Birch, ii. 374—379. Villeroy's report, Egerton, 34, 35.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1598. April 20. May 2.

Robert returned discontented with the result of his mission. Henry soon afterwards published the edict of Nantes, by which he secured to the Protestants every privilege which they could reasonably demand, though he forbade that of holding assemblies and making laws for their own security; and a few days afterwards he signed a treaty with Spain, by which he recovered Calais, and every place that had been severed from France during the war. The rest of his reign he spent in healing the wounds which had been inflicted on the country by religious fanaticism and private ambition; and his conduct deserved and obtained for him the love of his subjects and the respect of posterity.

During the negotiation between the French and Spanish ministers at Vervins, Philip had repeatedly signified his readiness to treat with the queen of England. The question was afterwards warmly discussed in the cabinet. Essex argued with his usual violence in favour of war; the Cecils contended as earnestly for peace. On one occasion the lord treasurer, putting the book of Psalms into the hands of the earl, pointed in silence to the verse, *Bloodthirsty men shall not live out half their days.* On Essex himself it made no impression; by the superstitious it was afterwards considered as a prediction of his subsequent fate. The queen, as usual, listened to both parties, but came to no decision.[1]

5. There was another question of equal interest which divided the cabinet. In Ireland almost the

Birch's Negotiations, 119—165. Camden, 759—763. Burghley's instructions respecting the treaty are in Strype, iv. 324. Mem. de Cheverny, ii. p. 13.

[1] Camden, 765—771. Psalm lv. 25.

whole population, whether of Irish or English origin, was leagued in open or clandestine hostility against the English government. The office of deputy was dreaded as full of difficulty and danger. The queen, by the advice of the Cecils, wished to give it to Sir William Knollys, the earl's uncle; Essex insisted that it should be conferred on Sir George Carew, one of his opponents. During the debate, Elizabeth addressed him in sarcastic language; he replied by turning his back with an expression of contempt. The queen, no longer mistress of her passion, struck him a violent blow on the ear, adding at the same time, June. that "he might go to the devil." Essex instantly grasped his sword; but the lord admiral interposed; and the earl, bursting out of the room, exclaimed that he would not have taken such an insult from her father, much less would he bear it from a king in petticoats.[1]

War was now openly declared, and the court and the whole nation looked forward with curiosity to the result. Both were equally obstinate; Essex demanding satisfaction for the blow, Elizabeth an apology for his presumption. The months of July and August passed without any advance on either side. In September the earl was, or pretended to be, seriously indisposed; but the queen, though she seemed to relent during his danger, relapsed into her former obstinacy with his recovery. His friends conjured him to make "submission" to his sovereign. Egerton, Oct. 15. the lord-keeper, wrote him a long letter of advice, to which he replied by one still longer, expressive of his Oct. 18. determination to resist, and to abide the consequences. Yet, contrary to the predictions of the courtiers, a

[1] Camden, 772. Birch, ii. 384.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1598. reconciliation was effected, and within a fortnight he returned to court. To the public he appeared again in favour; but in the heart of Elizabeth love had yielded the place to hatred; from that moment she gave the reins to his temerity and ambition, and allowed him to run forward to his own destruction.[1]

Nov. 6.

In the midst of these domestic quarrels the queen lost the most able and most trusty of her servants by the death of the lord Burghley. Other ministers may have possessed equal power; few have retained it for so long a period. During the forty years that he sat in the cabinet of Elizabeth, he was "her spirit," as she termed him, the oracle that she consulted on every emergency, and whose answers she generally obeyed. He has left behind him a voluminous mass of papers, his own composition, the faithful index of his head and heart. They bear abundant testimony to his habits of application and business, to the extent and variety of his correspondence, and to the solicitude with which he watched the conduct, and anticipated the designs of both foreign and domestic enemies; but it is difficult to discern in them a trace of original genius, of lofty and generous feeling, or of enlightened views and commanding intellect. In common with the statesmen of his age, he made expediency the polar star of his policy; and it must be admitted that few men have ever equalled him in the facility with which he created resources and discovered expedients, or the sophistry with which, on the spur of the occasion, he could cajole, or excuse, or mislead. Aware of his ingenuity, the queen was not without suspicion that he might practise upon herself the same arts by which he successfully circumvented others; and hence it hap-

August 4.

[1] Camden, 772. Birch, 385—393. Neg. 183. Cabala, 234.

pened that she treated him occasionally with neglect, occasionally with severity. But such clouds quickly passed away; to relieve herself from trouble, she had recourse again to his counsels; and, in gratitude for his services, shielded him from the insidious attacks of his rivals, both the favourites who sought to remove him out of the way of their own aggrandizement, and the ancient nobility, who looked down on the new man with scorn and vexation. By the long possession of office he was able to place himself, in point of wealth, on a par with the richest of the land; and after his decease his ashes were honoured with the tears of his sovereign. But, though the "old fox" was gone, he left behind him at court his younger son, Sir Robert Cecil, who, walking in the footsteps of his father, gradually supplanted every competitor, and became so necessary to the queen, that long before her death she made him, in opposition perhaps to her own feelings, the chief depository of the royal authority.

The same year was distinguished by a most extraordinary prosecution for the crime of treason. Among those who had followed Essex to Tercera was a private soldier named Squires, lately returned from a prison in Spain. Soon after the troops were disbanded, one Stanley arrived in England and accused Squires, before the earl of Essex and Sir Robert Cecil, of a design to poison the queen. At first he loudly maintained his innocence, but, when he had been five hours on the rack, he confessed that at Seville, Walpole, a Jesuit, had solicited him to commit the crime, had furnished him for that purpose with a most powerful poison, and had instructed him in the manner of em ploying it; and that, on his return to England, he had rubbed part of the poison into the pommel of the

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1598. saddle on which the queen rode, and the other part into the chair in which Essex was accustomed to sit, with the expectation that in both cases it would have produced death. It is difficult to conceive a more ridiculous or incredible tale; yet it brought the unhappy man to the scaffold. At his trial one of the counsel for the crown represented with great pathos the danger of Elizabeth; but his feelings grew too big for utterance; he burst into a flood of tears, and was compelled to sit down. The next who rose was more successful. His task was to describe her wonderful escape from the venom on the saddle. It was as evidently a miracle as any recorded in holy writ: "For "albeit the season was hot, and the veins open to re- "ceive any maligne tainture, yet her body felt no dis- "temperature, nor her hand no more hurt than Paul's "did when he shook off the viper into the fire."[1] The prisoner in his defence said that, while he was on the rack, he had confessed anything which he thought would satisfy the commissioners and relieve him from torture; the truth was, that Walpole had proposed the murder to him, but that he had never consented to do it, nor even employed poison for that purpose. Here one of the judges informed him that on his own showing he had been guilty of concealment of treason; and Sir Robert Cecil prevailed on him once more to confess the charge. He received judgment, and suffered the punishment of a traitor; but died asserting

Nov. 23. both his own innocence and that of Walpole with his last breath.[2]

[1] Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 189.

[2] Camden, 779, and Speed, 1183. On this extraordinary plot, see note (CC) at the end. It would appear that Squires and Stanley were both impostors. When Stanley was asked why he had accused Squires, he replied that the Spanish ministers, supposing that the

Before I conclude this chapter, I may advert to the conduct of the king of Scotland in the novel and extraordinary situation in which he found himself placed by the death of Mary and the caprice or policy of Elizabeth. On the one hand, the English queen had not fulfilled any of the promises made to him during the year 1588. She refused to admit his right to the succession; she excluded him from the inheritance of his father in England; she interfered in the internal concerns of his kingdom, intrigued with his subjects, and gave support to his rebels. She continued to treat him as she had treated Mary, though he had not given offence either by the assumption of her title, or by the profession of a hostile faith. By James her unkindness was attributed to the malice and influence of the Cecils, who, having brought his mother to the block, feared that he might avenge her blood on their heads if ever he should ascend the throne. In their hands was his chief competitor, Arabella Stuart, whose claim they might at any moment set up in opposition to his own. He proposed to marry her to the duke of Lennox, and to acknowledge that nobleman his presumptive heir. But Elizabeth refused; and the refusal added to the distrust and perplexity of the Scottish king.[1]

On the other hand, James had equal reason to fear the hostility of the Catholic powers, the ambition of

assassin had deceived them, had, through revenge, hired him to give information of the treason. He was then put on the rack, and made to confess that he himself had been sent by Christoval de Mora to shoot the queen.—See Cecil's letter in Birch, Negotiations, 184, 185.

[1] Winwood, i. 4. Birch, i. 84. Bartoli, 448. Strype, iv. 102, 106. Father Gordon had formed a plot to get her out of England. —Birch, ii. 307. Strype, iv. 102.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1598.

Philip, and the intrigues of the Spanish faction both at home and abroad. By all these he was charged with pusillanimity for his tame acquiescence in the murder of his mother, with apostasy on account of his preference of the reformed doctrines to the faith of his fathers. To have betrayed the least partiality towards that faith would, by uniting against him the Protestants of both kingdoms, infallibly have extinguished his hopes; at the same time to provoke the hostility of the Catholics was to involve himself in difficulty and danger. They formed in England and Scotland a numerous and powerful party; and the knowledge that his mother had left her right to the succession to the disposal of the pope and the king of Spain, unless her son should embrace the Catholic faith, would tend to loosen their attachment to the Scottish line. The bequest itself was, indeed, devoid of force; but he was aware that, in the event of invasion, or during the expected struggle for the crown after the death of Elizabeth, it might be brought forward in opposition to his claim, and would probably produce a strong sensation in favour of his competitor.

It has been thought that James in these circumstances formed no fixed plan of conduct, but allowed himself to be carried along by the current of events, without any compass by which he might guide, or any certain point to which he might direct his course. To me, however, he seems to have pursued uniformly the same policy, distrusting equally the English queen and the Catholic powers, and seeking equally to propitiate them both. To both he made similar promises of friendship; from both he solicited pecuniary aid; and, if either objected to him his connection with the

other, he always pleaded in his defence the hard necessity to which he was reduced.

After the death of Mary, the earls of Huntley, Angus, Errol, and other Catholic lords, treated on several occasions with the pope and the Spanish court, through the agency of the Scottish Jesuits Gordon, Tyrie, and Creighton. Their object was to avenge, with the aid of Philip, the execution of their queen, and to obtain, if not the re-establishment, at least the toleration, of the Catholic worship in Scotland; but on condition that the independence and liberties of the realm should be preserved, that no ecclesiastical censure should be issued against James, and that his right to the English crown should remain unimpaired. Their intrigues were often discovered by the English agents abroad, and as often communicated by Elizabeth to the king. He always expressed the highest indignation against the earls; but his deeds did not correspond with his threats; years elapsed, repeated embassies were sent, and the kirk remonstrated and threatened, before James could be persuaded to punish the conspirators. At length they were compelled to leave Scotland; but even then he would not permit the sentence of forfeiture to be executed against them. His apathy scandalized the zealots and irritated Elizabeth; but it may be satisfactorily explained, if we believe the assertions of the earls, that they acted sometimes with his permission, often with his connivance; and that he was unwilling to destroy a party, the existence of which was necessary to preserve him from falling under the absolute control of the English queen, and of her adherents in the kirk and state.[1]

[1] Camden, 656, 669. Winwood, i. 11, 13. Rymer, xvi. 190—

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1598.

The publication of "The Conference respecting the "Succession" had excited new alarms in the mind of James. The doctrine that the profession of heresy was a sufficient ground of exclusion was evidently pointed against him; and the preference given to the pretensions of the infanta of Spain showed that it was intended to set her up for his rival. He appointed Ogilvy, a Catholic baron, his envoy to the Catholic powers. At Venice, Florence, and Rome, Ogilvy contented himself with asserting that his sovereign was ready, in imitation of the king of France, to study the Catholic faith; and with pointing out the dangers which threatened the liberties of Europe, if Philip were permitted to annex England to his extensive dominions.[1] In Spain he adopted another course, and attempted to negotiate a most important treaty with the ministers of the Catholic king. He represented James as actuated by the desire of revenging the injuries offered to him by the queen of England; promised in his name that he would declare war against her, would embrace the Catholic faith, would re-establish it within his dominions, would supply Philip with a levy of ten thousand Scottish mercenaries, and would send, as a pledge of his sincerity, his son to be educated in the Spanish court; but on condition that the king should not pretend for himself, or for any

1595. November.

1596. January.

February.

May and June.

199, et seq. Birch, i. 109, 215, 216. Strype, iv. 110. They found that James was so pusillanimous that he always deserted them when it came to the trial. "Rex est pusillanimus," says Creighton in a letter to Tyrie, December 14, 1594, "et quamvis tempore "pacifico sit bonus, tamen in talibus tempestatibus est animo "prorsus consternato."—Ibid.

[1] See D'Ossat, Lettres, i. 221—224. The duke of Sessa's account of these negotiations was intercepted (ibid. 293); and having been forwarded to England, has been published by Birch, i. 407—418.

other in his right, to the succession to the English crown; should grant to James a subsidy of five hundred thousand ducats to begin the war; and should aid him with an army of twelve thousand men. But it had been observed that, on his arrival in Flanders, the envoy had consulted with Paget and his friends, known among the exiles by the name of the Politicians; and this circumstance, exciting the suspicion of the opposite party, induced them to oppose his endeavours in the Spanish court. They disputed the authenticity of his credentials; threw doubts on his religion and his veracity; and declared that James had on so many occasions deceived the Catholic lords and Catholic sovereigns that no reliance was to be placed on his words. In conclusion Philip dismissed the envoy with expressions of good-will towards his sovereign, and with a valuable present for himself.[1] CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596.

James, however, was not discouraged. He was aware that the Spanish party, in furtherance of their design, had urged the pontiff to issue a declaration against him, on the ground of heresy; and to oppose their intrigues he despatched Drummond on a mission to the court of Rome. This envoy was the bearer of a letter, in which the king expressed his gratitude to Clement, who had refused to listen to the suggestions of his enemies; observed that mutual benefit might arise from the permanent residence of a Scottish minister in the papal court; and for this purpose solicited the dignity of cardinal for the bishop of Vaison, a native of Scotland.[2] In addition, he gave to Drummond verbal instructions. What they were we Sept. 23.

[1] Winwood, i. 1—14, 52.
[2] See the original letter in Rushworth, i. 166.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1596.

know not. Two points only have been disclosed; that he should solicit an annual subsidy for the payment of a guard about the royal person, and that he should offer to intrust the castle of Edinburgh to the custody of the Catholics, and to dispose of the young prince of Scotland as the pope might think proper.[1]

It was not, however, long before these intrigues reached the ear of Elizabeth. She ordered Sir Thomas Brunkard to reproach the king with his duplicity; he affected the utmost surprise, and protested that he was wholly ignorant of the proceedings. Ogilvy and Drummond were examined and committed, the former to the castle of Edinburgh, the latter to the house of his mother; and the

1601. Feb. 5.

Scottish minister at the English court was ordered to complain of the queen's jealousy, and to require from her the proofs of the charge, that the prisoners might be brought to trial, and receive punishment, if it should be proved that they were guilty. We know of no further proceedings; and it is probable that the king, for his own honour, was careful to protract, or suspend, the inquiry till the death of Elizabeth.[2]

[1] From Rushworth it is plain that Drummond received verbal instructions; that these proposals were parts of them appears from Brunkard's charge in Birch, i. 420.

[2] Birch, ibid. Cecil, a priest, and one of the Spanish party who opposed Ogilvy in Spain, on some cause of discontent went over to Paget and the Politicians, and became a correspondent of the earl of Essex. There is reason to believe that he communicated to the English government the copies of Ogilvy's negotiation in Spain.—Compare Winwood, i. 52, 108, with Birch, i. 263. 407; ii. 306. From these and the intercepted despatches of the duke of Sessa, Elizabeth had sufficient evidence as far as regarded Ogilvy. Neither can there be any doubt respecting the mission of Drummond. Bellarmine published the letter of James; and to excuse the king, Balmerino his secretary confessed that he had sent it without the

There was another subject which contributed to widen the breach between the two princes. In 1598 Valentine Thomas, a prisoner on the charge of felony, privately confessed that he had been hired by the king of Scots to murder the queen. This avowal was received with surprise and horror. Valentine was repeatedly examined; his depositions were embodied in the form of an indictment; and a true bill was found by the grand jury of the county. Elizabeth now communicated the fact to James, with an assurance that she did not believe him capable of so atrocious a crime. The Scottish monarch at first treated the charge with silence and contempt; but, fearing that it might afterwards be urged as an objection to his claim to the crown, requested his good sister to send him an attestation of its falsehood under the great seal. The queen complied; but he had no sooner read the instrument than he returned it, saying that it was so worded as to appear rather a pardon of guilt than a declaration of innocence. Elizabeth complained of this conduct as an insult; recrimination followed recrimination; but it was not for the interest of either party to come to an open rupture; and after mutual remonstrances the matter was suffered to remain dormant.[1] The charge, however, sunk deep into the mind of James. He considered it as a convincing proof of the hostility of Cecil; and probably suspected, as the trial of Valentine was only

A.D. 1598. July.

1599. May.

royal warrant. He lost his office; but retained an ample fortune and the royal favour. That Creighton was also employed on the same mission as Drummond, appears from an original letter in the possession of the Rev. G. Oliver, to whose industry and research we owe the "History of Exeter, and Historic Collections relative "to the Monasteries in Devon."

[1] Camden, 781. Rym. xvi. 358, 373—378.

CHAP. VIII. A.D. 1599.

suspended during his good behaviour,[1] that it was but the first step taken to exclude him from the succession.

[1] "We have stayed his arraignment; and will do, so long as "the king shall give no cause to the contrarie, whereof you may "assure him."—Ibid. 357. When James came to the throne, he ordered his accuser to be hanged.—Camden, Annales Jacobi, 2.

CHAPTER IX.

TRANSACTIONS IN IRELAND — ADMINISTRATION OF PERROT — HIS TRIAL AND DEATH — REBELLION OF TYRONE — HIS VICTORY AT BLACKWATER—ESSEX LORD DEPUTY—HIS DISOBEDIENCE OF THE QUEEN'S ORDERS—CONFERENCE WITH TYRONE—RETURN TO ENGLAND — IMPRISONMENT AND TRIAL IN THE STAR-CHAMBER — HIS ATTEMPT TO RAISE THE CITY — HIS FAILURE, TRIAL, AND CONDEMNATION — HIS DEATH AND CHARACTER — OPPOSITION TO MONOPOLIES—VICTORIES OF MOUNTJOY IN IRELAND—SUBMISSION OF TYRONE—SECRET UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN JAMES OF SCOTLAND AND CECIL—DECLINING HEALTH AND LOW SPIRITS OF THE QUEEN—HER LAST SICKNESS AND DEATH—HER CHARACTER.

In Ireland the lord Grey, by his cruelty and rapacity, had earned the hatred of all descriptions of people. He was replaced by Sir John Perrot, supposed to be an illegitimate son of Henry VIII.; a man equally severe, but strictly impartial, who made no distinction between the English or the Irishman, but inflicted punishment on all offenders according to their demerits. During his administration, the late earl of Desmond was attainted by parliament, and the lands comprised within his earldom, amounting to almost six hundred thousand acres, were forfeited to the crown. It had long been the wish of the queen to colonize Ireland from England. Hitherto she had been deterred by consideration of the expense; now, however, Desmond's lands were granted to English settlers; and most of the royal favourites obtained ample districts, on the condition that one family

A.D. 1584.

1586.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1584.

should be settled on every two hundred and forty acres; and that no native of Irish origin should be admitted among the new colonists. But it was difficult both for the crown to enforce, and for the grantees to fulfil these conditions. The number of acres planted did not amount to one-half of the country, and among the settlers was a considerable number of the former inhabitants, who, rather than abandon the place of their birth, consented to hold of foreigners the lands which had descended to them from their progenitors.

Perrot had reduced Ireland to a state of tranquillity hitherto unknown in its annals. The indigenous Irish, observing the severity with which he punished the injuries inflicted on them by the English adventurers, looked up to him as their friend; but those who suffered from his justice sought to ruin him in the estimation of his sovereign. His hasty temper occasionally betrayed him into unseemly expressions; his words, his actions, and his friendships were misinterpreted and misrepresented; and Elizabeth began to doubt his loyalty, and to think him capable of seeking a kingdom for himself. Wearied out with insults and

1588.

opposition, he solicited his revocation; and on his return was admitted into the council in England. For some years the queen's jealousy seemed to sleep; but Perrot had spoken irreverently not only of her, but also of her "dancing" chancellor; the revenge of

1591. March.

Hatton awakened her suspicions; and in 1591 a secret inquiry was made into the conduct of the late deputy during his authority in Ireland. The men whose excesses he had repressed and punished eagerly supplied materials for his ruin; and the unfortunate Perrot was arraigned in Westminster Hall, on a

charge of high treason. The principal witnesses were Williams, formerly his secretary, O'Regan, an Irish priest, who, having conformed and married, had been employed by him as a spy,[1] and Walton, a stranger, of disreputable character. As far as their evidence went to show that he had favoured the Catholic clergy, negotiated with the duke of Parma and the Spaniards, and secretly encouraged the insurrections of the O'Ruarcs and the Burkes, it was undeserving of credit; but he could not deny that in moments of irritation, when he found his plans for the melioration of Ireland rejected by his enemies in the Irish council, and these supported against him by their friends in the English cabinet, he had let fall expressions highly disrespectful to the queen and her advisers. That he was innocent of treason, there cannot be a doubt; yet he was found guilty, and two months later received judgment of death. His son had married the sister of Essex, whose influence in his favour was balanced by the powerful combination of his enemies. For six months his fate was kept in suspense; but a broken heart, or a poisonous potion, deprived him of life. He died in the Tower; an instance, says Camden, how difficult it is for a prince to forgive the wounds inflicted by a slanderous tongue.[2]

CHAP. IX. A D. 1591. April 17. June 16.

Among the native Irish who had distinguished themselves in the war against the earl of Desmond, was Hugh, the son of the late baron of Dungannon. His services had merited the approbation of the lord 1585.

[1] For his services on this trial he received a pension of 40*l.* per annum.—Camden, 647. Murdin, 799.

[2] State Trials, 1315—1334. Camden, 645—647. Perrot's testament is in Hearne's Camden, 922—927.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1585. Grey, and he had been rewarded by the queen, first with the earldom of Tyrone, and afterwards with all the rights and lands which his grandfather Conn had formerly possessed. To this title of English origin he soon added, without her consent, another which rendered him far more respectable in the eyes of the natives. On the death of Tirlough Lynnogh, he proclaimed himself the O'Neil, and was considered by his countrymen as the Irish sovereign of Ulster. It would fatigue the reader to listen to the suspicions entertained of his fidelity, and his contrary protestations of loyalty; to examine the charges brought against him by the English governors, and their acts of violence alleged by him in justification of his conduct; to notice the temporary hostilities, the repeated truces, the illusory negotiations, which occupied the time, and perplexed the judgment, of several succeeding deputies. *He* required liberty of conscience; they replied that such liberty was dishonourable to God; he demanded the enjoyment of the rights possessed by his grandfather; they curtailed them to diminish his power and resources. The queen, whose attention was absorbed by the transactions on the continent, bore with impatience the very mention of Ireland. It was a kingdom which brought her nothing but expense and vexation;[1] nor did she blame the O'Neil so much as the interested policy of her officers, who (so she suspected) sought to carve out fortunes for themselves by driving the natives into rebellion.

1593.

[1] This was the opinion of many, "esteeming bothe Calayes and "Ireland rather a burden and a chardge; and therefore do thinke "it fit to leave them bothe, but for this onely respect; that where "Ireland hathe very good tymbre and convenient havens, yf the "Spaigniard might be master of them, he wold in short space be "master of the sease."—Lodge, ii. 231.

Hence she wished to extricate herself from the contest with Tyrone, provided she could do it with honour. She listened to his apologies, gave credit to his protestations, and instead of reinforcing her army, ordered her generals to negotiate a peace. If we may believe them, it was the object of Tyrone to procrastinate the war, till he could receive the succours which he had solicited from the pope and the king of Spain. If we give credit to him, he was sincere but cautious; he was content to live the subject of Elizabeth, but would not submit to be trampled into the dust by the oppression of her officers. After many alternations of peace and war, of victory and defeat, a decisive battle was fought near the fort of Blackwater in Tyrone. Bagnal, the English commander-in-chief, with fifteen hundred of his followers, was slain; the artillery, the ammunition, and the fortress itself fell into the hands of the enemy. The O'Neil was celebrated in every district as the saviour of his country; and the whole of the indigenous population, with many of the chieftains of English origin, rose in arms to assert the national independence.[1]

A.D. 1593.

1598. August 14.

When the state of Ireland was debated in the council, Essex, by his objections to the appointment of every other person, was supposed to betray his wish to obtain, though he scorned to solicit, the office of lord deputy. His enemies, eager to remove him from court, sought to gratify his ambition; and the queen was induced, though it cost her a long struggle, to grant all his demands. To the remission of a debt of eight thousand pounds was added a present of almost

1599. March.

[1] Camden, 688, 708, 715, 755, 783. Birch, i. 379; ii. 76, 273, 394. Sydney Papers, i. 351, 362; ii. 84. Lodge, iii. 66.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1599.

thrice that sum; the army to be placed under his command was fixed at eighteen thousand men, comprising the best levies in the counties, and some of the veteran companies in the Netherlands; and his commission invested him with privileges never enjoyed by his predecessors, the power of pardoning all crimes and treasons without exception, and of concluding peace, or continuing the war, according to his discretion.[1] Even his instructions were drawn in conformity with his own suggestion, that he should in the first place proceed with his whole disposable force against Tyrone, and reduce, if it were possible, the province of Ulster, the great focus of the rebellion. To superficial observers he appeared to have regained his former place in the royal favour; and even the queen at his departure had dismissed him with expressions of kindness. But her mind was still prejudiced against him; some of his officers received orders to transmit to her faithful reports of his conduct; and his adversaries in the council smiled at the alacrity with which he precipitated himself into the snare which had been laid for his destruction.

April 17.

His first act, after his arrival in Ireland, was in direct contradiction to the royal will. Elizabeth had forbidden him to give the command of the cavalry to his friend the earl of Southampton, who, by marrying in opposition to her pleasure, had incurred her dislike. Essex asked if she meant to revoke the powers specified in his commission. The queen made no reply; but the moment she heard that Southampton had been named to the office, she ordered him to be removed. Essex remonstrated with spirit, and it

July 11.

[1] Bacon's Works, iii. 127, 129, 142. Sydney Papers, ii. 146.

required a second and more peremptory letter before he would obey.[1]

But at this moment the royal attention was diverted from Ireland by the alarm of invasion. In 1598 Philip of Spain had been succeeded on the throne by his son of the same name, but of abilities far inferior to those of his father. The ministers of the new king, anxious to put an end to hostilities, which had inflicted severe wounds on the commerce of their country, and aware of the parsimony of the English queen, sought to incline her to peace, by driving her into extraordinary expense. She was informed that the Adelantado had again prepared a formidable armament at Corunna; next, that he had sailed; and lastly, that he had crossed the Bay of Biscay, and had been actually seen near the coast of Bretagne. The usual precautions were immediately taken; one army was ordered to be raised for the defence of the royal person, and another to oppose the invaders; and the earl of Nottingham was appointed commander-in-chief of all the forces.[2] At the same time the queen, apprehensive that Essex might return to make a tender of his services, forbade him to quit his charge in Ireland without a warrant under her own hand. Soon, however, the alarm subsided. The Adelantado had indeed sailed, but his fleet divided itself into two squadrons; the larger proceeded to the Canaries in quest of the Hollanders, the other, consisting only of

1598. Sept. 13.

Aug. 5.

[1] Birch, ii. 421, 423.

[2] Camden represents the real object of these preparations to have been to prevent the earl from bringing over the Irish army to England, for the purpose of driving his enemies from court (Camden, 797); but it is plain, from Winwood's Memorials, that the alarm actually existed.—See Winwood, 88, 91, 92, 95; also the Sydney Papers, ii. 112, 113.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1598. six galleys, directed its course towards England, and, to the surprise of the public, passed unobserved through the Channel, and anchored safely in the waters of Sluys.[1]

Essex had gone to Ireland for the express purpose of marching against Tyrone; yet, contrary to the expectation even of his enemies, he proceeded towards Munster, penetrated as far as Limerick, and, taking Cork and Waterford in his way, returned by the coast to Dublin. The reduction of two castles, and the feigned submission of three native chieftains, formed the sum of his exploits; and, if he magnified the importance of these advantages in his despatches, he was at the same time compelled to own that three months of the summer season had been consumed, and that his army had dwindled away by desertion, disease, and the casualties of war.[2] But the queen would listen to no apology; his demand of reinforcements only inflamed her anger, and he received a peremptory order to undertake the promised expedition. About the end of August, with only three thousand men, a force inadequate to its object, he met Tyrone on the banks of the Brenny. Instead of fighting, the two chieftains conversed together in private; the next day a more public conference was held; and an armistice was concluded, to be renewed every six weeks during the winter, on condition that the lord deputy should transmit to the queen the several demands of the O'Neil. Of these the most important were, that the Catholic worship should be tolerated; that the chief

1599. May 21. June 4. July 30. Aug. 24. Sept. 8.

[1] Winwood, 103. Camden, 802.

[2] The journal of this expedition is in Birch, ii. 398; and Nugæ Ant. 268. His excuse was, that it would be dangerous to march into Ulster before there was a certainty of fine weather, in the month of June.—Winwood, i. 40.

governor should be an earl with the title of viceroy; that the principal officers of state and the judges should be natives; that the O'Neil, O'Donnel, Desmond, and their associates, should enjoy the lands possessed by their ancestors for the last two hundred years; and that one half of the army in Ireland should consist of natives.[1]

This termination of the campaign, so contrary to his promises, completed the ruin of the earl in the mind of his sovereign. If the disappointment of her hopes revived her resentment, her ignorance of what had passed between him and Tyrone in their private interview provoked a suspicion of his loyalty. He might perhaps seek only to perpetuate his command by protracting the war; but it was also possible that his ambition might aspire to obtain the crown of Ireland through the aid of the O'Neil.[2] Essex, however did not allow her time to brood over these thoughts. To her astonishment, on the morning of Michaelmas-eve, just after she had risen, but before she was dressed, the door of her bedchamber opened, and she beheld Essex himself on his knees at her feet. He begged of her to pardon the intrusion, to attribute it to zeal for her service, which had brought him from Ireland to lay before her the true state of that kingdom. Elizabeth knew not whether to be angry or pleased. She gave him her hand to kiss, and he retired with a cheerful countenance, observing to his friends that, though he had met with many storms abroad, he had found a perfect calm at home. About noon he was admitted to an audience, and indulged in the same delusion; but in the evening the tempest

Sept. 28.

[1] Winwood, 118, 137. Nugæ Ant. 293, 301, 302.
[2] Bacon, iii. 145, 146.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1599.

burst upon his head. He was ordered to consider himself a prisoner in his room, and within a few days was delivered to the lord keeper, to be kept in free custody under his charge.[1]

The sudden return of Essex had been occasioned by an angry letter from the queen, which he attributed to the envious suggestions of his rivals. His first plan was to embark a body of two thousand cavalry, to land on the coast of Wales, to hasten to London, and to drive his political antagonists from the court. But he abandoned this dangerous expedient by the persuasion of his friend the earl of Southampton, and of Christopher Blount, formerly the supposed paramour, now the husband, of his mother; and consented, in imitation of the late earl of Leicester, to endeavour, by his unexpected appearance at court, to disconcert the intrigues of his enemies.[2] But Elizabeth did not allow the same artifice to succeed a second time. Her obstinacy had grown with her age; and an opinion prevailed that her passion was kept alive by the representations of Sir Robert Cecil, the earl of Nottingham, the lord Cobham, Sir Walter Raleigh, and their associates.[3] She vented it on all

[1] Winwood, 118. Sydney Papers, ii. 127—130, 131. Camden, 796. Bacon, iii. 121. A prisoner was said to be in free custody when he was permitted to remain in a private house, under the charge of a person who was responsible for his appearance. The degree of indulgence in these cases was regulated by the council; but, whether he were confined to his chamber, or had the liberty of the whole house, or were permitted to take the air to a certain distance, he was always under the eye of a keeper, appointed by the council, or by the person to whose custody he had been committed.

[2] State Trials, 1415.

[3] Camden, 799, 800. Whyte, in his letters, on two or three occasions, represents Cecil as favourable (Sydney Pap. 204, 213); yet he owns that Cecil refused to be reconciled, though he pro-

who had accompanied the earl. "When I came into "her presence," says Sir John Harrington, "she "chafed much, walked fastly to and fro, looked with "discomposure in her visage, and, I remember, "catched at my girdle, when I kneeled to her, and "swore, 'By G—d's Son I am no queen. That man "'is above me. Who gave him command to come "'here so soon. I did send him on other business.' "She bid me go home. I did not stay to be bidden "twice. If all the Irish rebels had been at my heels, "I should not have made better speed."[1]

But without the precincts of the court the public voice fearlessly declared itself in his favour. Men openly pitied his misfortune, and condemned the blind severity of the queen; his vindication was published in sermons from the pulpit, and in pamphlets from the press; several ministers had the boldness to pray for him by name in their churches; and even within the palace libels on his supposed enemies were found scattered on the floors, and affixed to the walls. Alarmed by these indications of the public feeling, the earl of Nottingham and Sir Robert Cecil assumed to themselves the merit of mitigating the royal displeasure. But the anger of Elizabeth was inexorable; and her desire of vengeance was sharpened by every interposition in his favour.[2] If she condescended to

mised to show no malice (ibid. 136); and Essex repeatedly numbers him among his enemies.—Camd. 832, 837, 838, 852.

[1] Nugæ Antiquæ, 354. Harrington had received a hint to keep a journal of the proceedings in Ireland. The queen now demanded to see it. After she had heard it read, "she swore by G—d's Son "we were all idle knaves, and the lord deputy worse, for wasting "our time and her commands in such wise as my journal doth write "of."—Ibid.

[2] At this time Hayward, a civilian, published his history of the deposition of Richard II., and dedicated it to Essex, with expres-

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1599. —

say that she sought "his amendment and not his "destruction," it was not till she had consulted the judges, and had learned, to her disappointment, that he could not be charged with high treason. Still the solicitations of his friends were rejected; his offers of submission were requited with expressions of contempt; nor could his relations, not even his countess, obtain access to his prison. Anxiety of mind produced indisposition of body; but experience had taught the queen that such ailments were generally feigned, and she at first refused to allow her physician to see the patient. When, however, she was assured that there was little probability of his life, she began to relent; she even sent him a mess of broth from her own hand, and added, with tears in her eyes, that she would have visited him herself, if it had not been inconsistent with her honour. The earl, like Wolsey, was recalled to life by the hope of repossessing the royal favour; and the queen, like her father, relapsed into her former antipathy in proportion as the sick man recovered.[1]

Dec. 12.

In this manner the fate of Essex occupied for several months the attention of the court. Elizabeth revolved in her mind a variety of plans; each was successively approved and rejected; and the earl, though he obtained permission to be confined in his

sions of high esteem for his character. The queen ordered him to be imprisoned, and inquired of Bacon, whether the offence of Hayward did not amount to high treason. Afterwards she persuaded herself that Hayward was only the publisher, and wished him to be racked that he might discover the real author. "Nay, madam," said Bacon, "he is a doctor. Never rack his person, but rack his "style. Let him have pen, ink, and paper, and help of books, "and continue the story where it breaketh off, and I will under- "take, by collating the styles, to judge whether he be the author "or not."—Cabala, 81.

[1] Sydney Pap. ii. 146—159.

own house, saw no prospect of a favourable result. At last the rashness of his sister, the lady Rich, who had circulated copies of a letter written by her to the queen,[1] provoked Elizabeth, in her own vindication, to bring him to a private trial before a court of eighteen commissioners, empowered to pass "censure," but not judgment, on the prisoner. In presence of this singular and unconstitutional tribunal, composed of men his political rivals and enemies, Essex appeared on his knees, with his papers in his hat lying before him on the floor. The proceedings lasted eleven hours. After a considerable time, permission was granted to him, at the suggestion of the archbishop, to rise and stand; later in the day he was suffered to support himself by leaning against a cupboard; and towards the conclusion he was indulged with a seat without a back. The crown lawyers, Yelverton, Coke, Flemming, and the man that owed his own preferment to the friendship of Essex, Francis Bacon, exerted all their powers of rhetoric in exaggeration of his offence. He had neglected to prosecute the war against Tyrone, had submitted to a disgraceful interview and treaty with that rebel, and had returned to England in defiance of the royal prohibition. Only once did the earl lose the command of his temper, when he repelled with bitter scorn the imputation of treason thrown out by Sir

1600. June 5.

[1] Her letter began thus: "Early did I hope this morning to have "had mine eyes blessed with your majesty's beauty;" and ends with these words: "Let your majesty's divine power be no more "eclypsed than your beauty, which hath shined throughout all the "world; and imitate the Deity, not destroying those that trust in "your mercy."—Birch, ii. 443. These passages show what kind of flattery was believed to have the most influence with the queen. Her celestial beauty had then "shined throughout all the world" during no less a space than sixty-seven years.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1600.

Edward Coke; to the other charges he replied by pleading guilty, but contending that they were errors of the head, not of the heart. Each commissioner severally pronounced his own individual "censure," or opinion respecting the guilt of the prisoner, and the punishment which he deserved; the queen received their report, and it was resolved that Essex should be sequestered from the exercise of every office which he held by patent, and should remain a prisoner at the royal pleasure.[1] Elizabeth's anger was now mollified; she persuaded herself that she had not only broken the proud spirit of her fallen favourite, but had convinced the world, by the censure of the court, that she had not punished him beyond his deserts. Yet, as often as she was solicited to show him favour, something infallibly happened to revive her displeasure,—unpleasant intelligence from Ireland, or the pretensions of the knights whom he had made during the campaign, or, as was believed, the secret misrepresentations of the courtiers, who gave themselves out to the public as his friends. With respect to the earl himself, he devoted his time to exercises of religion, declaring that the tears of his repentance had quenched the fire of his ambition, that he had made an eternal divorce from the world, and that, if he still desired the royal favour, it was not for any earthly object, but merely that he might quit this life in peace with one whom he revered as the image of the Almighty. Elizabeth began to look with an eye

July 3. of compassion on the repentant sinner; she ordered his keeper to be removed; a month later she granted him

August 26. permission to leave his house at his pleasure; but

[1] Moryson's Itinerary, part ii. 68, 74. Sydney Pap. ii. 187—206. Camden, 828—830.

when he solicited the favour of being admitted once only to her presence, a scornful refusal was returned, with an admonition that he was not yet free from her "indignation," but must consider himself a prisoner under the charge of his own discretion.[1]

The submission and contrition so recently manifested by Essex were, however, but a mask, under which he covered the turbulent workings of his passions.[2] On his commitment, his friends, particularly the earl of Southampton and the lord Mountjoy, apprehensive for his life, had earnestly laboured to effect his escape. Southampton even offered to be the companion of his flight, and the partaker of his fortunes in a foreign realm. But Essex resolutely replied that he would never condescend to live in exile; he would either recover his former greatness, or perish in the attempt.[3]

Of the different projects which had offered themselves to his mind, the most flattering, both to his pride and resentment, was that from which he had

[1] Bacon, iii. 152. State Trials, 1419. Winwood, 250, 254. Sydney Pap. 206—216. It was probably about this time that Raleigh (Murdin, 812) wrote to Sir Robert Cecil, advising him "not to relent towards the tyrant." The contents of the letter show that the date of 1601 on the back is a mistake.

[2] "My lord of Essex shyftethe from sorrowe and repentance to "rage and rebellion so suddenlie, as well provethe him devoide of "goode reason as righte mynde. In my laste discourse, he uttered "strange wordes borderinge on suche strange desygns, that made "me hasten forthe and leave his presence. Thank heaven! I am "safe at home, and if I go in suche troubles againe, I deserve the "gallowes for a meddlynge foole. His speeches of the queene be-"comethe no man who hath *mens sana in corpore sano*. He hathe "ill advysers, and muche evyll hathe sprunge from thys source. "The queene well knowethe how to humble the haughtie spirit; "the haughtie spirit knoweth not how to yield, and the man's "soule seemeth tossede to and fro, like the waves of a troubled sea."—Harrington, Nugæ Antiquæ, i. 179.

[3] Birch, ii. 470.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1600.

been dissuaded in Ireland,—the forcible seizure of the royal person, and the banishment of his enemies from the council. With this view he now solicited the co-operation of the king of Scots, and of Mountjoy, who had reluctantly accepted the dangerous office of deputy in Ireland. If that nobleman gave, he soon recalled, his assent. He was willing to risk his life to save that of his friend; but the necessity had ceased; and, since his trial, Essex was no longer in danger of dying by the axe of the executioner.[1] The earl bore the disappointment with patience; but at Sept. 29. Michaelmas his monopoly of sweet wines expired, and his petition for a renewal of the lease was eluded by the queen, who replied that she would first inquire into its annual value; that, when horses became un- Nov. 2. manageable, it was usual to tame their spirit by stinting them in the quantity of their food. He petitioned Nov. 17. a second time; and she appointed a commission to conduct the monopoly for her own benefit. He waited till the 17th of November, the anniversary of her coronation, when the courtiers were accustomed to crowd to her levee, to offer presents and addresses. On that day she received from Essex an humble and eloquent letter, well calculated to rekindle her affection, if a single spark were yet alive in her breast. This, in the shipwreck of his fortune, was the last plank to which he clung. It failed him; the letter remained unnoticed; and the unfortunate earl abandoned himself to the suggestions of despair.[2]

Hitherto he had lived in privacy and solitude; now the doors of Essex House were thrown open to every comer; his former dependants were summoned from

[1] Ibid. 471. [2] Winwood, i. 271. Birch, ii. 462.

the country; and their number was recruited by the accession of bold and needy adventurers. At the same time he invited the most zealous among the Puritan preachers, whose daily sermons drew crowds of fanatics around him; and he proposed to certain theologians the question whether it were not lawful, in the case of mal-administration, to compel a sovereign to govern according to law.[1] As another resource, by a trusty messenger he sent professions of his attachment to the king of Scotland, informing him that the earl of Nottingham, Cecil, Raleigh, and Cobham, the faction which ruled at court, were leagued to place the Spanish infanta on the throne at the death of the queen; advised him to require the immediate recognition of his right to the succession; and promised on the arrival of the ambassadors to risk his life and fortune in defence of the house of Stuart. James, who had long distrusted the intentions of the secretary, received the offer with pleasure, and resolved to despatch two envoys to England, ostensibly on a mission to the English queen, but in reality to assure the earl of his approbation and support.[2]

To elude suspicion, the principal of the conspirators were accustomed to assemble at Drury House, the residence of the earl of Southampton. Thence they communicated by writing with Essex, and discussed

[1] "The Earle of Essex is now altogeather at his howse near "temple barr, in no favour as yet with her Majestie but growing "againe to wonted popularyty, by beying often visited by many of "the nobility, as the erles of Worcester, Southampton, Sussex, Rut-"land, Bedford and others, with many captaines and cavaliers, and "the whole pack of Puritanes, insomuch as now it is thought bothe "the Queene and Mr. Secretary stand in some awe of hym, and "would make hym surer if they durst."—Private letter, January 13.

[2] Birch, ii. 508, 509.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601. Feb. 2. Feb. 7.

the several plans which he suggested. That which appeared least objectionable was, that they should proceed in force to the palace, that Sir Christopher Blount with his party should take possession of the gate, Sir John Davis of the great chamber, and Sir Charles Davers of the guards; and that the earl, with certain noblemen, should throw himself on his knees before the queen, and refuse to rise till she had granted his petition. Nothing, however, was finally determined; and, while he waited with impatience for the answer of the king of Scots, he was precipitated into a new course by the vigilance of the ministers, whose suspicions had been excited by the concourse of people at Essex House, and whose fears were now confirmed by a secret communication from Sir Henry Neville. To secretary Herbert, who brought the earl an order to appear before the council, he replied that he was too unwell to leave his apartment; in a few minutes he received a note from an unknown writer, warning him to provide without delay for his own safety; and this was followed by intelligence that the guards had been doubled at the palace and in its neighbourhood. His only hope of success depended on expedition. During the night he despatched messengers to assemble his friends; on their arrival in the morning, he informed them that a plot was laid for his life, and requested their company, while he proceeded to the queen, and solicited her protection against the malice of his enemies. It was Sunday; at ten in the forenoon the lord mayor, aldermen, and companies would assemble at St. Paul's Cross; and he had determined to join them at the conclusion of the sermon, and to call on them to follow him to the palace. To a cool observer the experiment must have

appeared hazardous and uncertain; but he was buoyed up with the belief of his own popularity, and the knowledge that a few years before the duke of Guise, in similar circumstances, had, with the aid of the Parisians, successfully braved the authority of his sovereign.

Feb. 8. From the execution of this project he was diverted by an unexpected arrival. A little before ten he was told that Egerton, the lord keeper, the earl of Worcester, Knollys, the comptroller of the household, and the lord chief justice, stood at the gate, demanding admission. He gave orders that they should be introduced through the wicket, but that all their attendants, with the exception of the pursebearer, should be excluded. Egerton demanded the cause of this tumultuary meeting; to whom Essex, raising his voice, replied, "There is a plot laid for my life; "letters have been counterfeited in my name; and "assassins have been appointed to murder me in bed. "We are met to defend our lives, since my enemies "cannot be satisfied unless they suck my blood." "If such be the case," said Popham, "let it be "proved; we will relate it fairly; and the queen "will do impartial justice." After the mention of impartial justice, the earl of Southampton complained of the assault made upon him by the lord Grey; but was told that the guilty party had suffered imprisonment for the offence.[1] Egerton desired Essex to

[1] In Ireland, Southampton had put Grey under arrest for one night, because he had charged the enemy without orders. This had occasioned several challenges, which had been defeated by the queen's vigilance. "Notwithstanding that they ar commanded "uppon theire allegiance not to medle with ech other, yet the last "weeke the lo. Grey, with many of his followers, drew in the "strand uppon the earle, who was on horseback with a footeboy

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

explain his grievances in private; when several voices exclaimed, "They abuse you, my lord, they are undoing you. You lose your time." Egerton, turning round and putting on his cap, commanded in the queen's name every man to lay aside his arms and to depart. But Essex immediately entered the house; the lords followed; and the crowd shouted, "Kill them, keep them for pledges, throw the great seal out of the window." Having passed through two rooms, guarded by musketeers, they were introduced into a back parlour; when the earl, desiring them to have patience for half an hour, ordered the door to be bolted, and intrusted his prisoners to the care of Sir John Davis, Sir Gilly Merrick, Francis Tresham, and Owen Salisbury.

Returning into the court, Essex drew his sword, rushed into the street, and was followed by the earls of Rutland and Southampton, the lords Sandys and Mounteagle, and about eighty knights and gentlemen; to whom were afterwards added, through friendship or fear, the earl of Bedford, the lord Cromwell, and about two hundred others. At Ludgate he prevailed on the guard to let him pass, protesting that his object was to save his life from the violence of Lord Cobham, Sir Walter Raleigh, and their accomplices. But he found the streets empty; there was no meeting at St. Paul's Cross; and the citizens, in consequence of orders from the lord mayor, remained quiet within their houses. The earl proceeded, shouting, "For the

"only by hym; his boy lost his hand, but the erle defended hym "selfe till clubbes came to succour hym; for this fact, the lo. Grey "is committed prisoner to the fleete, and the said Earle of South- "ampton much commended." January 13.—See also Winwood, i. 47, 292.

"queen, my mistress!" till he arrived at the residence of Smith, one of the sheriffs, and, as he believed, his devoted partisan. But Smith was not to be found; his absence convinced the unfortunate nobleman of the failure of his plan; and unable to conceal his agitation, he retired to a private room, to compose his spirits.

At court the earl possessed so many friends, that the ministers knew not whom to trust. By their orders the guards were mustered; the gates of the palace were closed and fortified; and every passage in the neighbourhood was obstructed with chains and carriages. The queen alone had the boldness to talk of going in search of the insurgents. Not one of them would dare to meet a single glance of her eye; they would flee at the very notice of her approach. About two in the afternoon Lord Burghley with a herald, and the earl of Cumberland with Sir Thomas Gerard, ventured to enter the city in different quarters, and proclaimed Essex a traitor, offering a reward of one thousand pounds for his apprehension, and a full pardon to such of his associates as should immediately return to their duty. The earl had by this time left the house of sheriff Smith, with blasted hopes and diminished numbers. He drove Lord Burghley before him; but was repulsed by the guard at Ludgate, and, returning to Queenhithe, proceeded by water, with fifty companions, to Essex House. Here his disappointment was converted into despair. The imprisoned lords, whom he had considered as hostages for his own safety, were gone. They had been liberated by the command of his confidant, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, who sought by this service to purchase his own pardon. As a last resource he began to fortify

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

the house; in a few minutes it was surrounded by the royalists under the lord admiral. A parley ensued between Sir Robert Sydney in the garden, and Essex and Southampton on the roof. The demands of the earls were refused; but a respite of two hours was granted, that the ladies and their female attendants might retire; and about six, when the battering train had arrived from the Tower, the summons was repeated. Lord Sandys proposed a desperate sally; they might either cut their way through the enemy, or die, as brave men ought to die, with their swords in their hands. But Essex, who still cherished a hope of life, consented to surrender on the promise of a fair trial. That night the chief of the prisoners were lodged in Lambeth Palace; the next morning they were conveyed to the Tower.[1]

Feb. 12. The preceding evening Thomas Lee, a soldier of fortune, had offered his services to Sir Robert Cecil; four days later he was heard to say that, if the friends of Essex meant to save him from the block, they should petition for his pardon in a body, and refuse to depart till it had been granted. Sir Robert Cross communicated this remark to the secretary; orders were issued for the apprehension of Lee; and the pursuivants discovered him the same evening, in the crowd at the door of the presence-chamber, during Feb. 13. the queen's supper. In the morning he was arraigned on a charge of intending to murder the sovereign, and Feb. 14. the next day suffered the death of a traitor. No man, who will read the report of his trial, can entertain a doubt of his innocence. But his conviction produced

[1] See Camden, 845; the State Trials, 1333—1350, 1410—1451; and note at end (DD).

this effect; it persuaded the queen that her safety was incompatible with the life of Essex.[1]

In a few days the two earls were arraigned before the lord Buckhurst, as lord steward, and twenty-five other peers. Essex, looking round from the bar, said that he saw among the lords several who were known to be his personal enemies. These he should challenge; it was the privilege of the lowest subject in the land; it could not be refused to one belonging to the first order in the state. The judges were consulted, who replied that the law had drawn a broad distinction between peers and jurors. The former gave their verdict on their honour; and, as they could not be sworn, so neither could they be challenged.[2] Feb. 19.

The indictment charged the prisoners with having imagined the deposition and the death of the queen. It was supported with great vehemence by the crown lawyers, Yelverton, Coke, and Bacon, who drew their arguments from the open and acknowledged facts that Essex and Southampton had imprisoned the four counsellors, had entered the city in arms, had called on the inhabitants to rise, had refused to disperse at the royal command, intimated by a herald-at-arms, had assaulted

[1] It is published in Howell's State Trials, i. 1403. Camden's observation is, pro temporum ratione salutaris hæc visa est severitas (p. 847). On the day of Lee's arraignment, Sir Robert Cecil is said to have made a speech in the Star-chamber, the violence of which may be perhaps excused on account of the excitement raised so lately by the attempt of Essex; but which charges the earl with treasons not afterwards mentioned at his trial.—Harl. MS. 6854; and Life of Sir R. Cecil, 60.

[2] Camden, 848. The peers were the earls of Oxford, Nottingham, Shrewsbury, Derby, Worcester, Cumberland, Sussex, Hertford, and Lincoln; the viscount Bindon; the lords Hunsdon, Delaware, Morley, Cobham, Stafford, Grey, Lumley, Windsor, Rich, Darcy, Chandos, St. John of Bletso, Burghley, Compton, and Howard of Walden.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

the military force posted at Ludgate, and had fortified and kept Essex House against the army under the command of the earl of Nottingham. Essex replied that he did not speak to preserve his life—it was not worth the preserving—but he stood there to preserve his honour. He had never entertained a thought of injuring the queen; nor were the acts assigned any proof of such an intention. If he had taken up arms, and had invoked the aid of the citizens, he could justly plead that it was done through necessity. The lord Cobham and Sir Walter Raleigh sought to take his life; that the queen's authority afforded little protection, had been shown by the late atrocious assault committed in the open street by the lord Grey on the earl of Southampton; and in such circumstances he could conceive no other means of safety than to repel force by the employment of force.

In refutation of this plea, it was urged that at Drury House the conspirators had proposed to seize the person of the queen, and to compel her to govern according to the pleasure of Essex; that the irruption into the city was the result of that project; and that this fact would be proved to the satisfaction of every impartial man, by the evidence of some, and the confessions of others, among the conspirators.

At the mention of Drury House, the earl betrayed symptoms of agitation. He had carefully destroyed every suspicious paper, and rested with entire confidence on the secrecy of his associates. However, he soon recovered himself; and, when Sir Ferdinando Gorges appeared as a witness, examined him sharply, extorted from him an acknowledgment that no injury was intended to the queen, and inferred from his manner and hesitation that he had been tampered

with in the Tower, and was therefore unworthy of credit. In conclusion, he observed that, whether the consultations at Drury House were criminal or not, was a question which did not concern him; they were held by other persons; he had never been present.

Southampton adopted a different line of defence. He maintained that, though many projects had been mentioned in these meetings, nothing had been concluded; that to consult was not to determine; that there was no connection between the meetings in question and the attempt to raise the city; that the latter arose entirely from occurrences which could not have been foreseen, from the information of immediate danger to the life of Essex, and the unexpected arrival of the four counsellors.[1]

As the trial proceeded, the earl was reproached with having said that the kingdom was bought and sold. He vindicated the expression on the ground that Sir Robert Cecil, who ruled as if he were the sovereign, had maintained that the right of the infanta of Spain was equal to that of any other among the competitors. Cecil, who was present, but unseen, instantly started from a private box, and, having obtained permission to speak, insisted that the earl should either name the person from whom he received the information, or be content to have his assertion accounted a calumny. Essex refused; but in his anxiety to repel the charge of falsehood, remarked that his fellow-prisoner had heard it as well as himself. The secretary, turning to Southampton, conjured him by their former friendship, and as he was a Christian man, to name the informer.

[1] Camden, 849—851. State Trials, 1333—1350.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

In this trying moment Southampton appealed to the court, whether it were consistent with reason or with honour that he should betray the secret. All replied in the affirmative, and he named Sir Robert Knollys, comptroller of the household, and uncle to Essex.[1]

While a serjeant-at-arms was despatched for Knollys, Sir Edward Coke arose, and accused Essex of hypocrisy and irreligion, because, while he pretended to be a Protestant, he had promised toleration to Blount, his father-in-law, a known Catholic. The earl replied that the charge was false; that he had always lived, and should die, a Protestant; that he had never made any promise of toleration to Blount; but that he did not consider it an essential part of the reformed worship to put Catholics to death on account of their religion.[2]

When Knollys arrived, he gave a new but unsatisfactory version of his conversation with the two earls. If we may believe him, what he had heard from Cecil, and had repeated to his nephew, was not that the claim of the infanta had been maintained by Cecil, but by Doleman, who had dedicated his book to Essex. The earl shortly replied that he had understood him in a very different sense. "Your mis-

[1] Camden, 854. The French ambassador, who was present, says that the reply of Essex "picqua si fort le secretaire (pour en estre "paraventure quelque chose) qu'il se prit à crier tout hault, qu'il ne "feroit jamais service à sa majesté, si on ne lui ostoit la teste comme "à un traistre." He adds, "il n'avoit pas oublié ce jour la petite "boite: car en ma vie je ne le veis plus beau"—and, a little later, that the peers "à leur contenance redoubtoyent plus se petit homme, "que leur conscience, et que leur royne."—Winwood, i. 299. This letter soon became public, and, to appease the secretary, was disavowed by the ambassador.

[2] It is singular that the editors in the first edition substituted the milder expression, cruciarentur, for that in the original, morte afficerentur, Hearne's Camden, 855.

"understanding arose," exclaimed the secretary, "from your opposition to peace. It was your ambition that every military man should look up to "you as his patron, and hence you sought to represent me and the counsellors, who wished to put an "end to the war, as the pensioners of Spain."[1]

To certain questions put by the lords, the judges replied, that it was rebellion in a subject to attempt to raise a force which the sovereign could not resist; and that in every rebellion the law supposed a design against the crown and life of the sovereign, because it became the interest of a successful rebel that the sovereign should not reign nor live to punish the rebellion. After an hour's deliberation, the peers pronounced both the prisoners guilty. Essex observed that, as he should not solicit, so neither should he refuse mercy; that, though the lords had found him guilty according to the letter of the law, he believed that they had acquitted him in their own consciences; and that he hoped they would intercede for the life of his fellow-prisoner, who had offended more through affection for him than through any other motive. Southampton followed. His only object had been to obtain redress for his friend, whom he believed to have been treated harshly. The law might suppose in him the intention of deposing and killing the queen, but he knew that no such thought had ever suggested itself to his mind. His crime was a crime of ignorance. Yet he submitted to his fate, and threw himself on the mercy of the queen. He had spent the best part of his patrimony and endangered his life in her service; and if, in pity of his ignorance,

[1] Winwood, i. 300. Camden, 854.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

she were pleased to make him the object of mercy, he should receive the favour with humility and gratitude.

The lord steward pronounced judgment; the edge of the axe was turned towards the prisoners; and Essex observed, as he left the bar, that his body might have rendered better service to his sovereign; but it would be as she pleased; if his death proved an advantage to her, it was well. He begged that Ashton, his favourite minister, might attend him; made an apology to the counsellors whom he had confined; and asked pardon of the lords Morley and Delaware, whose sons, though entirely ignorant of the plot, had been drawn by him into the same danger with himself.[1]

Essex was followed to the Tower by Dove, dean of Norwich, who exhorted him to make his peace with the Almighty by the confession of his treason. The earl replied, that in what he had done he had committed no offence against God. He attempted to justify his refusal to appear before the council by the example of David, who had disobeyed the summons from Saul; and contended that his office of earl marshal authorized him to reform the abuses in the government. To Dove succeeded Ashton, who, it was believed, had previously received his lesson from the secretary. This perfidious divine assumed a bolder and harsher tone. He rejected the earl's protestations of innocence as the sinful evasions of a guilty conscience; and threatened him with the vengeance of an omniscient Judge unless he should make a full and sincere confession. Whether it was through the fear of death, or the menaces of the preacher, the spirit

[1] Camden, 855—857. State Trials, 1350—1358.

of Essex was at last subdued. He sent for the lord keeper, the treasurer, the admiral, and the secretary, solicited their forgiveness, and made an ample avowal of every ambitious and unlawful project which had entered his mind; betrayed the secrets of the men whom he had seduced to aid him with their counsel and exertions; and disclosed the object of the negotiation between himself and the king of Scots. His confession filled four sheets of paper; but its accuracy has been doubted; and his associates complained that he had loaded both himself and them with crimes of which neither he nor they were guilty.[1] Feb. 22.

The eyes of the public were now fixed on Elizabeth. Some persons maintained that she had not the heart to put her former favourite to death—her affection would infallibly master her resentment; others, that she dared not—revenge might urge him on the scaffold to reveal secrets disreputable to a maiden queen.[2] But his enemies were industrious; and, while they affected to remain neutral, clandestinely employed the services of certain females, whose cre-

[1] Winwood, 301, 303. State Trials, 1430, 1442, 1447. Birch, ii. 478—480. Camden, 865.

[2] Osborn, Miscellany, 212. "Undutiful words of a subject," Raleigh writes, "do often take deeper root than the memory of ill "deeds do: the late earl of Essex told Queen Elizabeth that her "conditions were as crooked as her carcase; but it cost him his "head, which his insurrection had not cost him, but for that "speech."—See Birch's Works of Raleigh, i. 223. Many believed that this was the real cause of his execution within the Tower. There is, indeed, something suspicious in the earnestness with which Cecil instructs Winwood to declare in the French court that Essex had petitioned to die in private (Winwood, i. 302). When the envoy performed the commission to Henry IV., that monarch exclaimed, "Nay, rather the clean contrary: for he desired nothing "more than to dye in publik."—Ibid. 309. Barlow, however, in his sermon, says that, according to the earl himself, he had asked for a private execution, "lest the acclamations of the citizens should "hove him up."—Birch, ii. 482.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601. dulity had been formerly deceived by the earl, and whose revenge was gratified by keeping alive the irritation of their mistress. From them Elizabeth heard tales of his profligacy, his arrogance, and his ingratitude to his benefactress, whom he had pronounced "an old woman, as crooked in mind as she "was in body."[1] This insult to her "divine beauty" sunk deeply into her breast, and, jointly with his obstinacy in refusing to sue for mercy, steeled her against the apologies, the solicitations, and the tears of his friends. She signed the fatal warrant; but, with her usual indecision, first sent her kinsman, Edward Carey, to forbid, and then the lord Darcy, to hasten, its execution.[2]

Feb. 25. About eight in the morning Essex was led to the scaffold, which had been erected within the court of the Tower. He was attended by three divines, whose words, to use his own expression, had ploughed up his heart. Never did a prisoner behave with greater humility, or manifest a deeper sorrow. He acknowledged his numerous transgressions of the divine law; but when he came to his offence against the queen, he sought in vain for words to express his feelings. He called it "a great sin, a bloody sin, a crying and "infectious sin, for which he begged pardon of God "and his sovereign." Whether he still indulged a hope of pardon, is uncertain; but it was remarked that he never mentioned his wife, or children, or friends; that he took leave of no one, not even of his

[1] Osborn, Memoirs, 93. She had told him that he must be careful to confine himself to his insolent contempt of her person, "de "mepriser sa personne insolemment comme il faisoit," for it would be worse for him, "s'il touchast a son sceptre."—Beaumont, from her own words in Von Raumer, ii. 181.

[2] Camden, 860.

acquaintances then present, and that, when he knelt down to pray, he betrayed considerable agitation of mind.[1] The first stroke took from him all sense of pain; the third severed his head from the body.

Thus, at the premature age of thirty-three, perished the gallant and aspiring Essex. At his first introduction to Elizabeth he had to contend against the dislike with which she viewed the son of a woman who had been her rival, and a successful rival, in the affections of Leicester. If he overcame this prejudice, it was not owing to personal beauty or exterior accomplishments.[2] In these respects, if we except the exquisite symmetry of his hands, he was inferior to many gentlemen at court. But there was in him a frankness of disposition, a contempt of all disguise, an impetuosity of feeling, which prompted him to pour out his whole soul in conversation; qualities which captivated the old queen, fatigued as she was with the cautious and measured language of the politicians around her. She insisted on his constant presence at court, and undertook to form the young mind of her favourite; but the scholar presumed to dispute the lessons of his teacher; and the spirit with which he opposed her chidings, extorted her applause. In every quarrel his perseverance was victorious; and his vanquished mistress, in atonement for the pain which she had given, loaded him with caresses and favours. Hence he deduced a maxim, which, however it might

[1] Bacon, iii. 179. Winwood, i. 301. Birch, ii. 481—484. Camden, 859. The most pressing instructions had been previously given to the officers and divines to prevent him from speaking of the nature of his offence, or of his associates, and to confine him to a simple declaration of sorrow for his treason.—See Jardine, 374.

[2] He stooped forward, walked and danced ungracefully, and was slovenly in his dress.—Watton, Reliquæ, 160.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

succeed for a few years, finally brought him to the scaffold—that the queen might be driven, but could not be led; that her obstinacy might be subdued by resistance, but could not be softened by submission.

Contrary to the lot of most favourites, he had enjoyed at the same time the affection of the sovereign and of the people. To the latter he was known only by the more dazzling traits in his character,—his affability and profusion, his spirit of adventure and thirst of glory, and his constant opposition to the dark and insidious policy of the Cecils. His last offence could not, indeed, be disguised; but it was attributed not so much to his own passions, as to the secret agents of his enemies, working upon his open and unsuspecting disposition. To silence these rumours, an account of his treason was published by authority, charging him, on his own confession, and the confessions of his associates, with a design to place himself on the throne. But the charge obtained no credit; and the popularity of the queen, which had long been on the wane, seemed to be buried in the same grave with her favourite. On her appearance in public, she was no longer greeted with the wonted acclamations; and her counsellors were received with loud expressions of insult and abhorrence.[1]

The death of Essex contributed to save the life of Southampton. He would cease to be an object of apprehension, when he could be no longer swayed by the counsels of his unfortunate friend; and Cecil owed to him some return for the opportunity which he had afforded him at the trial of rebutting the

[1] Osborn, Miscellany, 204. Birch, ii. 510.

charge so confidently made by Essex. But, though the ministers solicited the queen in his favour, though they extorted from her a reprieve from the block, they could not obtain his discharge from the Tower. Cuffe, the secretary, and Merrick, the steward of Essex, suffered the usual punishment of traitors; which was commuted into decapitation in favour of Blount, his stepfather, and of Davers, the friend of Southampton. For it was in this ill-advised enterprise as it had been in the more atrocious conspiracy of Babington; men risked their lives through affection for others. If Southampton adhered to Essex, or Davers to Southampton, it was because they deemed it a duty prescribed by friendship, to live or perish together.[1]

March 13.

The king of Scots, in consequence of his engagement with the conspirators, had previously appointed the earl of Marr, and Bruce, abbot of Kinross, his ambassadors to England. Though the failure of the attempt was known in Edinburgh before their departure, they were authorized to promise that James would put himself at the head of the party, if there still remained any reasonable prospect of success.

March 6.

[1] Ille nihil contra nisi quod periculum fortunarum et capitis in hac causa præ amore erga Southamptonium neglexerit.—Camden, 865. State Trials, 1448. Sir John Davies, Sir Edward Baynham, and Mr. Lyttleton were also condemned. But the first obtained a pardon after a year's imprisonment; Baynham purchased his with a sum of money to Sir Walter Raleigh; and Lyttleton, having surrendered his estate of seven thousand pounds per annum, and paid a fine of ten thousand pounds, was removed from Newgate to the King's Bench, where he died three months afterwards.—Birch, 496. Camden, 858. Sir Henry Neville, the ambassador to the court of France, had been invited to Drury House before his departure. If we may believe himself, he only heard some disloyal conversation, which he condemned, and then departed. The confession attributed to Essex made him more criminal. He was confined in the Tower till the queen's death.—Winwood, 302, 325. Camden, 871. Yet Cecil affirmed that the first hint of the plot was received from him. —State Trials, 1441.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

They found the adherents of Essex plunged in the deepest despair, the people in a state of discontent, and Cecil possessing in reality the exercise of the sovereign power. Veiling their object, they congratulated the queen on her escape from the control of the conspirators; affirmed in strong language the innocence of their master, not only as to that, but as to all other attempts against her life or authority; requested in his name that she would pardon such of her subjects as were imprisoned for the sole offence of having visited him in Scotland,[1] and demanded an addition to his annual pension, and a promise that nothing should be done to the prejudice of his right to the succession. James dared not hope for success in this negotiation. He knew that Essex had betrayed the secret connection between them, and he expected every bad office from the presumed hostility of Cecil. Under this impression he instructed the two envoys to inform the queen, when they took leave, that he would never give her any cause of complaint during her time, but that the day must come, when there would exist no bar between him and the base instruments whom she trusted, and that from them he would exact a severe account of their present injustice and presumption.[2] But the envoys

[1] As Sir William Evers. "He was brought prisoner to London "and committed there, and it was thought some farther matter "would have fallen out against his brother the lo. Evers, the lo. "Willowby and others, about the Scottish affayres. Since that "tyme the matter hath lyen as it were in a dreame, and Sir "William close prisoner, but not knowen where."—Private let. January 13, 1601.

[2] James had certainly been persuaded that Cecil would oppose his succession. But in favour of whom? I suspect of Arabella Stuart. In the "secret correspondence" after their reconciliation, many sneers are thrown out against the claim of that lady, and Lord Shrewsbury and his mother are represented as seeking to raise her

were spared the necessity of employing this menace. Cecil was a thorough-bred politician, who measured his friendships and enmities by his personal interest. When Elizabeth was tottering on the brink of the grave, it was not for him to brave the resentment of her successor. How the reconciliation was effected, is not precisely stated; but the result appears to have been an agreement that all past causes of offence should be forgiven, that the king should receive an addition of two thousand pounds to his annuity, and that Cecil, with the aid of the lord Henry Howard, should silently pave the way for his succession at the death of Elizabeth. The secretary, however, required silence as an indispensable condition. Should the secret transpire, should even a suspicion be provoked of any concert between him and the Scottish king, the jealousy of Elizabeth would pronounce Cecil a traitor and James a rival; and it should be remembered that the court contained many who, through interested motives, would gladly infuse such notions into the royal mind. This advice was approved and adopted. The correspondence which followed between the parties was carefully concealed from the knowledge of the queen and the courtiers, and generally passed through the hands of the lord Henry Howard in England, and of Marr and Bruce in Scotland. Cecil continued to act as if he had no eye to the succession of James; and James affected

to the throne, though the letters in Lodge (iii. 124, 153), show, that at the same time Cecil pretended to be a sincere friend to the earl. In the very first letter, written to be shown to James, Arabella is called "Shrewsbury's idol, who, if she followed some men's counsels, "will be made higher by as many steps as will lead to the scaffold." The earl has no influence, and his mother can make no friends to the cause.—Secret correspondence of Sir Robert Cecil with James, vi. 14, 15.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

to speak of him as of one from whom he had no reason to expect any service.[1]

Essex, in his confession, had betrayed the project for his release from captivity, to which the lord Mountjoy had formerly given his assent. Though that nobleman had conducted the war in Ireland with a vigour and success which raised him to a high pre-eminence above all former deputies, he knew that he had reason to dread the resentment of the queen, and had made every preparation to seek, at the first summons, an asylum on the continent. Cecil, however, convinced her that it stood not with her interests to irritate a favourite general at the head of a victorious army. Dissembling her knowledge of his guilt, she acquainted him, in a long and gracious letter, with the trial and execution of Essex; assured him that in her distress it afforded her consolation to think of his loyalty and attachment; begged him to keep a watchful eye over the conduct of the officers who had received commissions from his predecessor; and instructed him to be prepared against the armament destined to invade Ireland from the coast of Spain.

[1] See Birch, ii. 510, 513, and the "secret correspondence," the whole tenor of which seems to me to establish the previous understanding between Cecil and the Scottish envoys. See particularly, pp. 92, 121. It has, indeed, been shown by the judicious author of the life of Sir Robert Cecil (in Cabinet Cyclop.) that the name of that statesman ought not to have been introduced into the title-page. The letters were not written by Cecil, but by the lord Henry Howard; some portions of them were carefully concealed from the knowledge of Cecil; and there is no proof that any (with perhaps one exception, 123) was ever submitted to him. Still it is plain that the lord Henry wrote them in the character of the confidant and associate of Cecil, sometimes by his express direction, and generally in the joint names of them both, using either the plural pronoun "we," or the words "Cecil and I, Cecil and myself." Hence these letters may fairly be taken as expressive of the sentiments of Cecil. —See pp. 100, 108, 123, 134, 143, 188, 209.

In a short time four thousand men, under the command of Don Juan D'Aguilar, arrived. They landed at Kinsale, fortified the town, and called on the natives to join them against a princess who had been excommunicated and deposed by several succeeding pontiffs.[1] A.D. 1601. Sept. 21.

Whilst Mountjoy assembled an army to oppose the invaders, Elizabeth summoned a parliament to meet at Westminster. Unwilling that men should notice her increasing infirmities, she opened the session with more than usual parade; but her enfeebled frame was unable to support the weight of the royal robes; and she was actually sinking to the ground, when the nearest nobleman caught and supported her in his arms. The only object of the minister was to obtain a supply of money for the Irish war; and his wish was gratified by the unexampled vote of four subsidies, and eight tenths and fifteenths. But if the members were liberal in their grant to the crown, they were obstinate in demanding the redress of their grievances. The great subject of complaint, both within and without the walls of parliament, was the multitude of monopolies bestowed by the queen on her favourites.[2] By a monopoly was understood a patent signed by her, and vesting in an individual, as a reward for his real or pretended services, the exclusive right of vending some particular commodity. This custom began in the seventeenth year of her reign, and grew in a short time into an intolerable abuse. If it supplied her with the means of satisfying importunate suitors without cost to herself, yet to the public each patent operated as a new tax on Oct. 27.

[1] Camden, 880—886.
[2] Secret Correspondence, 25, 26.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601.

the consumer. Sometimes the patentee exercised the right himself, often he sold it to another; but in both cases all subordinate vendors throughout the kingdom were compelled either to purchase the article in the first instance from the monopolist, or to pay him a yearly premium for the permission to sell it. Hence, wine, vinegar, oil, salt, starch, tin, steel, coals, and numerous other commodities, among which were several of the first necessity, and, therefore, of universal consumption, had of late years been advanced to double the usual price; and the representatives of most counties and boroughs had been instructed by their constituents to demand the abolition of so oppressive a grievance. The motion was soon made: by the advisers of the crown it was met with the argument that the granting of monopolies was a branch of the prerogative; that whoever only touched the prerogative, would incur the royal indignation; that to proceed by bill was useless and unwise, because, though the two houses might pretend "to tie the "queen's hands by act of parliament, she still could "loose them at her pleasure;" and that the speaker was blamable to admit such motions, contrary to the royal commandment given at the opening of the session. It was, however, replied, that the patentees were the blood-suckers of the commonwealth; that the people could no longer bear such burdens; that the close of the last parliament had shown how little redress was to be expected from petition; and that the only sure remedy was to abolish all monopolies by statute. This perseverance of the Commons shook the resolution of the minister, who was terrified by the execrations of the people as he hastened in his carriage through the streets; and subdued the obsti-

Nov. 18.

Nov. 20.

nacy of the queen, who, though she annually became more attached to what she deemed the rights of the crown, yielded at length to his suggestions and entreaties. Sending for the speaker, she assured him, in the presence of the council, that she never signed a patent of monopoly till she had been told that it would prove beneficial to the nation; that she was under obligations to the members who had brought the abuse to her knowledge; that she would, by proclamation, revoke every patent prejudicial to the liberties of the subject; and would suspend all others till their validity should be ascertained in the courts of law. The Commons, happy to obtain redress without engaging in a contest with their sovereign, returned her thanks in language little short of blasphemy; and Cecil prided himself on the dexterity with which he had satisfied the people, without surrendering the prerogative of the crown.[1]

Nov. 25.

In the meanwhile, the lord deputy in Ireland had united his forces with those of the president of Munster, and besieged D'Aguilar with his Spaniards within their lines at Kinsale. Tyrone watched the operations of the besiegers. With six thousand natives, and about two hundred Spaniards, who had landed at Castlehaven, under the command of Ocampo, he hastened early in the morning to surprise the English camp, ordering another party at the same time to convey a supply of provisions to the besieged. But his project had been already betrayed to Lord Mountjoy, and his advance was retarded by the anxiety of Ocampo to introduce something like regularity into the ranks of the natives. As the latter were crossing

[1] D'Ewes, ii. 644—654. Townshend, 224, 230, 248.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601. a brook, they were charged by a body of four hundred horse, and immediately fled. The Spaniards, abandoned by their allies, threw down their arms, crying Misericordia; five hundred Irish were slain in the pursuit; and the O'Neil, collecting about two thousand of his best men, retired into the north. D'Aguilar, convinced of the hopelessness of resistance, surrendered Kinsale and the forts in his possession, and obtained permission to return to Corunna with his men, their arms, and ammunition. Elizabeth received the news with warm expressions of gratitude; and a hope was cherished that by this signal service Mountjoy had atoned for his former disloyalty.[1]

1602. Jan. 2.

The departure of the Spaniards was followed by the reduction of Munster. The superiority of the English force, and the destructive ravages of famine, plunged the natives into despair; after a few contests, in which neither party gave quarter, resistance seemed at an end; and the conquerors remained in undisputed possession of a province which was now become no better than an extensive wilderness. From Munster Tyrone sought his usual asylum in the north; but the deputy allowed him no leisure to breathe; he was continually hunted by the garrisons from Blackwater, Charlemont, and Mountjoy; his followers perished by hundreds through extremity of want; and the spirit of the O'Neil was at last subdued. He offered to submit on honourable terms; but the pride of Elizabeth demanded an unconditional surrender.

In England the lords of the council laboured to mollify the obstinacy of the queen. They represented to her, that the Spaniards had adopted her

[1] Camden, 886—892. Winwood, i. 369, 370, 378. Lodge, iii. 152; and MS. letter.

own policy; that they kept alive the flame of rebellion in Ireland to exhaust her finances, and detain her forces at home; that for several years she had been compelled to maintain in that island an army of twenty thousand men, at an annual expense of more than three hundred thousand pounds; that she had it now in her power, by a few trifling concessions, to relieve herself from this intolerable burden, and to secure the English ascendancy in Ireland. But they had an additional reason which they dared not mention. They wished to effect the pacification of that kingdom before her death, lest the Spanish monarch should find there a powerful party already in arms to support his pretensions to the Irish, as well as to the English crown. After a long contest, she began to relent; but it was still impossible to fix the indecision of her mind; and each succeeding week new and contradictory instructions were forwarded to the deputy. Mountjoy was perplexed; he knew not what answer to give to Tyrone; and the time was consumed in useless messages from one to the other. But the moment he heard that the life of the queen was in danger, he sent for the Irish chieftain, who made his submission on his knees, renounced the title of O'Neil, and all dependence on foreign authority, and solicited the restoration of his rights and honours from the mercy of his sovereign. Mountjoy, in return, subscribed a full pardon for him and his followers, and promised that his lands, with one or two exceptions, and his former title, should again be vested in him by a patent from the crown. From Mellifont they proceeded to Dublin, where they first heard of the death of Elizabeth. Tyrone burst into tears; but, though he condemned his precipitancy, it was too late to

1603.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1602.

recede; he renewed his submission; and the few natives who refused to imitate his conduct, retiring to the continent, sought for support by fighting the battles of foreign powers.[1]

To prevent the Spaniards from making a second descent in Ireland, the admirals Levison and Monson had been despatched to cruise off the coast of Spain. But a carrack of immense value, moored under the castle in the small harbour of Sesimbria, offered an irresistible temptation. They silenced the batteries, carried off the prize, and returned with it in triumph to Plymouth. In defence of this violation of their orders, they pleaded that the fleet had been shattered by the weather, and that the plague was actually raging in two of the ships. The ministers were perplexed; but it was agreed to conceal the whole proceeding from the immediate knowledge of the queen; every exertion was made to equip another squadron, and in a few days Monson sailed again to his former station. Six galleys, however, commanded by Spinola, deceived his vigilance, and, creeping along the French coast, entered the channel. There they were deserted by their good fortune. They fell in with a squadron of Dutch and English ships commanded by Mansell; and the result of several successive actions was that three were sunk, and the other three escaped into the harbour of Sluys. With this victory closed the naval operations of Elizabeth's reign.[2]

The time so long dreaded by the queen had at length arrived, when, to use her own expression, men would turn their backs on the setting, to worship the

[1] Moryson, 200—300. Camden, 892, 905—909.
[2] Camden, 893—896. Private MS. letter.

rising sun. It was in vain that she affected the vigour and gaiety of youth; that, in opposition to the unanimous advice of the council, she persisted in making her annual progress; and that every other day she fatigued her decrepit frame with riding on horseback to view the labours of the chase and the other sports of the field.[1] No art could conceal her age and infirmities from the knowledge of her subjects; the consequences of her approaching demise became the general topic of conversation at court; and every man who dared to give an opinion was careful to name as her successor the king of Scots.[2]

September

[1] Lord Henry Howard writes to the earl of Marr, only five months before her death, "the queen our sovereign was never so gallant "many years, not so set upon jollity." To divert her from making her annual progress, the council had objected that it would hinder the harvest by taking up carts, &c.; but she was obstinate. "Order is given yesterday for the remove the same day sevennight; "hunting and disporting in the meantime every other day, which is "the people's ague." The earl of Worcester says, September 19, "We are frolyke heare in courte; mutche dauncing in the privi "chamber of countrey dawnces befor the Q. M. whoe is exceedingly "pleased therewith."—Lodge, iii. 148. At this time the queen had a new favourite, the young earl of Clanricarde. "He resembles "much the late earl of Essex, and is growing to be a favourite." August 25. "He courtes it in the best manner, and is graced by all, "being in speciall grace and favour with the greatest of all." September 15. "He is brought forward to prevent the rise of Mount-"joy, and to counterpoyse the young earl of Pembroke." September 22. "He is in speciall favour with her matie, but hath many that "envy and maligne it." November 17. "He holdeth still in good "grace with her matie." December 15.—MS. letters. "Flat-"terers say that he resembles Essex; the queen dissembles, and "says that she cannot love him; inasmuch as he recalls her sorrow "for that nobleman."—Beaumont, December 8. By mistake he is called Clancarty in Von Raumer, ii. 185.

[2] Secret Correspondence, 127. We are told that in the autumn of 1600 she hunted daily on horseback, and continued the sport long.—Syd. Pap. ii. 213, 214. The following was written, 7th April, 1602. "On Richmond greene she (the queen) walketh "often, with greater shewes of ability, then can well stand with her "years. Mr. Secretary swayes all of import albeit of late much "absent from the courte and about London, but not omitting in his

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1602.

Some apprehension, however, was excited by the mysterious silence of Cecil. No artifice could draw his secret from his breast. To every question he warily replied that he was the minister of Elizabeth; it was his duty to serve her; he had nothing to do with the appointment of her successor. James also was true to his engagement. Many attempts were made to elicit his opinion of the secretary; but his answer was uniformly the same; that though he had no reason to rely on the services of that minister, yet he saw nothing in his conduct which proved him to be an enemy.[1]

The apparent apathy of Cecil might damp, it did not extinguish, the eagerness of others. All who had anything to hope or fear from a new reign, sought to assure James of their attachment, and to make him the tender of their services. But of no individuals was the secretary more jealous than of the earl of Northumberland, the lord Cobham, and Sir Walter Raleigh, who had been his associates against Essex, but were now his opponents at court. All three met regularly at Durham House, undertook to form a party in favour of James, and through the duke of Lennox, the political opponent of Marr, assured him of their readiness to hazard their lives and fortunes

"absence dayly to present her Majestie with some jewell or toy "that may be acceptable. Thother of the counsayle or nobilitye "estrainge themselves from court by all occasions, so as, besides "the Mr. of the horse, vicechamberlain, and comtroller, few of "accounte appeare there. Mens hominum novitatis avida."—MS. Letter.

[1] Secret Correspondence, 17, 30, 88, 122, 192. "Never was the "world, both within and without, more finely cozened, which proves "that both honest men and good workmen have the cause in hand-"ling, and therefore non transibit ista generatio donec evenerint "omnia."

in his service.[1] Cecil was alarmed; and the lord Henry spared not the most odious insinuations to ruin them in the royal estimation. James was repeatedly warned to give no credit to their professions; for they were men poor in fortune, and destitute of friends; without the ability, even if they had the will, to serve him; atheists in principle, and capable of every crime to accomplish their purposes. They might indeed assume the garb of friendship, but they would prove enemies at heart; their object was to discover his secrets, that they might betray them, to procure food for the jealousy of the queen, that they might remove Cecil from her councils, and make themselves the arbiters of the succession.[2]

It was evidently the object of the two friends to confine the royal favour to themselves and their partisans. Under the modest pretence of imparting advice, they presumed to trace out the plan of conduct which James was to pursue; to designate the

[1] It is worth while to notice here Northumberland's opinion of his two associates from one of his letters to James. "The first of "these two I know not how his heart is affected; but by the latter, "whom sixteen years of aquaintance hath confirmed unto me, I "must needs affirm Raleigh's ever allowance of your right; and "although I know him insolent, extremely heated, a man that "desires to seem to be able to sway all men's fancies, all men's "courses, and a man that out of himself, when your time shall "come, will never be able to do you much good nor harm, yet I "must needs confess what I know; that there is excellent good "parts of nature in him; a man whose love is disadvantageous to "me in some sort; which I cherish rather out of constancy than "policy; and one whom I wish your majesty not to lose, because I "would not that one hair of a man's head should be against you "that might be for you."—Aikin, vol. i. 57, 58.

[2] Ibid. 28—52, 66, 67, 107. Lord Henry Howard calls them "the diabolical triplicity" (p. 26); and afterwards, speaking of Cobham and Raleigh, "your lordship may believe that hell did "never spew up such a couple, when it cast up Cerberus and "Phlegethon" (132).

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1602.

names of the persons to whom, and to whom alone, application should be made for support; and to dictate the contents of the very letters which should be written to them with that view.[1] They ventured even further. Experience had taught them that Elizabeth might be governed by exciting unfounded alarms in her mind;[2] and they sought by similar artifices to acquire the guidance of her expected successor. Howard in his letters began to talk of plots against the king's life and his rights; told him that he cherished enemies in his very court; and intimated some apprehension that the indiscretion and prejudices of his queen, unless they received a timely check, might prove fatal to the royal hopes.[3] James, however, had

[1] Aikin, vol. i. 77, 90, 92, 93.

[2] "The queen," says Howard, "is a lady that rather hears than "compares, numbers than weighs, and by consequence would make "all probable that is poetry" (mere imagination).—p. 95. It requires some acquaintance with the enigmatical style of this writer to understand him. He means to say, that Elizabeth believes all that is told her; it is sufficient that a thing may happen, for her to be convinced that it will happen.

[3] Ibid. 140—168, 217. They complain of the king's clemency to Dethick. "Were he now with us," they say, "as he is with "you, we should teach him which way judicare came into the "creed." They then observe that the king's life must be preserved by miracle; "for it cannot be from the manner in which justice is "administered" (p. 225). It appears from MS. letters in my possession that Dethick had been employed by Cecil as a spy in Florence, where James had much dealing with the grand duke; that he returned to London, and went thence to Edinburgh, where he had an audience of the king, but was afterwards refused access to the court. One morning, coming down from his chamber into the shop of the house in which he lodged, he drew his sword and killed one Jeamie; and, on his examination, answered that he had made a mistake, and killed the wrong Jeamie. Cecil knew not what suspicions this accident might raise in the mind of James. He sent for the former host of Dethick from Florence, and induced the queen to require that the murderer should be hanged in Scotland, or put into her hands. But James saved the man's life, under the conviction that he was insane, and confined him within the castle of Edinburgh.

both the discernment to see the object of the writer, and the resolution to act in pursuance of his own judgment. Notwithstanding the prohibition of his "secret correspondents," he accepted with expressions of gratitude and good-will the offers of Northumberland; received graciously those who came to make to him the tender of their services; authorized them to canvass among their friends in his favour;[1] and intimated, or caused it to be intimated, to Cecil and his associate that, in place of dark and mysterious hints, he expected a more open manifestation of the conspirators and of their designs; and that he considered as a personal insult the irreverent language in which they had spoken of his consort. They hastened to apologize, applauding his sagacity and foresight, and praying him to excuse their own alarms, which had proceeded solely from attachment to his person and solicitude for his interests.[2]

The question of the succession was as warmly agitated among the exiles abroad as among the courtiers and politicians at home. The reader is acquainted with the plan of the Spanish faction to place the infanta on the English throne. As long as she was at liberty to marry either the king of Scots or an English nobleman, it was hoped that the nation might be induced to admit her claim; but from the moment of her union with the archduke Albert, the most sanguine of her partisans began to despond.

[1] Aikin, vol. i. 105. "The Scottes K. hath many solliciters in "England, that labour to make all principal men for his party "against her majesties decease, offering all presente securitie under "the kinges owne hand for liberty of conscience, confirmation of "privileges and liberties, restitutions of wronges, honoures, titles, "and dignities with encrease according to deserte." December 15 1602.—A MS. letter, signed A. Rivers, in my possession.

[2] Secret Correspondence, 168, 170, 173, 176, 199, 202, 228.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1602.

After the death of Cardinal Allen, in 1594, Persons left the court of Spain to reside at Rome. He now professed to limit his views to the succession of a Catholic sovereign; who that sovereign might be was not for him to determine; it was a question which he left to the decision of the pontiff, the neighbouring princes, and the people of England.[1] But there could be no doubt that, on the death of Elizabeth, many competitors would appear; and that on such an occasion the Catholic monarchs, in union with the Catholic natives, might form a powerful party in favour of a Catholic claimant. Attempts had formerly been made to steal away the lady Arabella Stuart as a dangerous rival to the infanta; she now became the favourite of the faction; it was proposed that she should marry the cardinal Farnese, who could trace his descent from John of Ghent; and that all Catholics should be exhorted to support their united pretensions. When this visionary scheme was suggested to Clement VIII., he appeared to entertain it with pleasure, but was careful not to commit himself by any public avowal of his sentiments. He signed, indeed, two breves addressed to the English nobility and clergy. But in them he mentioned no name. He merely exhorted the Catholics to refuse their aid to every claimant who would not promise to support the ancient worship, and to take the oath which had formerly been taken by the Catholic monarchs. These

[1] "I am indifferent to any man livying, that hath or shall have "right thereto, of what place or people soever he be, so that he be "a Catholyke; but if he be no Catholyke, as it belongeth not to "my vocation to stryve against him, so I must confesse, that soe "long as he is soe, nothing under heaven can move my heart and "will to favour his pretensions."—Persons to the earl of Angus, January 24, 1600. Plowden's remarks on Panzani, 359. See also Winwood, i 388

instruments were forwarded to the nuncio at Brussels, and through him to Garnet, the superior of the Jesuits, with an injunction to keep them secret till the death of Elizabeth. Garnet obeyed; and, on the succession of the king of Scots, prudently committed them to the flames.[1]

The opposite faction, under the control of Paget and his friends, pursued a contrary course. Their original object had been to support the claim of the Scottish queen. At her death, all her rights devolved on her son. Him therefore they acknowledged for heir apparent to the English crown; and from his gratitude or justice promised to themselves the mitigation of their sufferings, and the toleration of their religion. Affecting the praise of loyalty and patriotism, they openly condemned the conduct of Persons and his adherents; they even submitted to act the part of spies, and betrayed the plans and proceedings of their adversaries to both the English and Scottish governments.[2] But in England Paget possessed little

[1] Lettres D'Ossat, ii. 502—509. Butler's Memoirs, 259. One great obstacle, which they could not remove, was the opposition of the king of France, whose interest it was that England should never be possessed by a prince allied to the king of Spain. On this account Henry refused to listen to any overtures from the Spanish party. When Aldobrandini suggested to him that he and Philip might consult together on the subject, he replied, that it was impossible they should agree, for two reasons; "à cause de la jalousie, "que la condition et proximité de leurs etats les obligeoient d'avoir "l'un de l'autre: et pour etre leurs intelligences audit Royaulme "fort contraires; d'autant que tous les prestres et catoliques du "pais pratiquez par les jesuites regardoient le roi d'Espagne, et "ceux, qui leur etoient opposites, inclinoient de son côté."—D'Ossat, ii. App. 12. Persons, however, did not despair. About three months before the queen's death, he renewed the proposal to the cardinal D'Ossat, and appears to have brought him over to his opinion.—Ibid. 580.

[2] Winwood, i. 51, 52, 89, 94, 101, 161. The ambassador Neville pleaded much in their favour with the secretary, though he

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1602.

influence among the Catholics, who looked upon him as one of the originators of Babington's plot, and the cause of all the evils which had sprung from it; whilst his adversary Persons, from the high consideration which he enjoyed among his brethren, exercised extensive authority over a portion of the missionaries. This induced several secular clergymen to consult together; they persuaded themselves that the present severity of persecution had been sharpened at least by the proceedings of the Spanish faction; and, forming themselves into an association, resolved to petition for the appointment of Catholic bishops, that, like their brethren in other countries, they might live under episcopal authority, and might be more widely separated from the men whose connection with the leaders of the opposite party had rendered them, whether justly or unjustly, objects of suspicion to the queen. At first Persons supported, soon he opposed, their design: instead of several bishops, one archpriest was appointed; and *he* received secret instructions to consult the provincial of the Jesuits in England on all points of particular importance. It is plain, from the subsequent conduct of Clement, that the pontiff sought only to put an end to the dissensions among the missionaries; but the projectors of the measure had in view a great political object. They had persuaded themselves that, by subjecting all the secular priests to the government of a single superior attached to their party, they should be able, at the death of the queen, to employ the influence of the whole body in

despaired of success. "There is none of them but offer oath of "absolute obedience to the temporal government, and to employ "body, goods, and life against any invaders, renouncing all benefit "of dispensation or other evasion from it" (p. 162).

support of a favourite candidate for the crown.[1] But their hopes were deceived. The appointment gave dissatisfaction, several clergymen appealed from the authority of the archpriest, and sent deputies to Rome to prosecute the appeal. Clement, after a long hearing, listened in part to their complaints; for, though he confirmed Blackwell, the new superior, in his office, he reprimanded him for his intemperate conduct, and forbade him, for the sake of peace, to ask or receive, in the discharge of his duty, the advice of Garnet, or of any of his brethren.[2] Oct. 5.

The queen's ministers had noticed the origin, and watched the progress, of this controversy. Their hostility to the Spanish party induced them to favour the cause of the appellants, who, through the intermediate agency of Bancroft, bishop of London, were indulged with the means of corresponding with each other, with facilities for the publication of tracts in their own defence, and with passports for the deputies whom they sent to Rome.[3] But the connection could not long be concealed. The zealots among the Puritans were scandalized; they openly accused the ministers of a secret and mysterious understanding with the popish missionaries; and Cecil deemed it necessary to furnish public and unequivocal proof of

[1] This was asserted by Winwood, and D'Ossat, ii. 506. It is proved by a memorial in favour of the archpriest in my possession. "La principale ragione è non solo per conservare l'unione vivente "la regina, sino molto piu dopo la sua morte per procurare qualche "successore cattolico conforme a certi brevi, che S. S. ha scritto gia "prudentissimamente alli cattolichi."

[2] See the breve in Dodd, ii. 262.

[3] In these passports they were said to have been banished.—Winwood, i. 373. He adds, "which party soever shall gain, the "common cause must needs lose, whose nakedness shall be dis-"covered, and shown displayed to the view of the world."—Ibid. January 6, 1602.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1602.

his orthodoxy. A proclamation was issued in the name of Elizabeth, in which she noticed the division of the Catholic clergy into two parties, one of the Jesuits and their adherents, the other of the secular priests, their opponents. The former she pronounces traitors, without any exception; the latter, though less guilty, are disobedient and disloyal subjects, who, under the vizard of a pretended conscience, steal away the hearts of the simple and common people. She then complains that, in consequence of her clemency towards both these classes of men, they even "adven-"tured to walk the streets at noon-day," and carried themselves so as to breed a suspicion that she proposed to grant a toleration of two religions, though God knew that she was ignorant of any such imagination, and that not one had ever ventured to suggest it to her. In conclusion, she commands all Jesuits, and all priests, their adherents, to quit the kingdom within thirty days, and all others, their opponents, within three months, under the peril of suffering the penalties enjoined by law against persons who had received ordination by authority of the bishop of Rome.[1]

1603. Jan. 29.

The proclamation was followed by the establishment of a new commission, for the sole purpose of banishing the Catholic clergymen. It consisted of the archbishop, the lord keeper, lord treasurer, and several other counsellors and judges, of whom six were a sufficient number to form a court. They were empowered to call before them every priest whom they thought proper, whether he were in prison or at large, and, without observing any of the usual forms of trial, to send him into banishment, under such conditions

[1] Rymer, xiv. 473—476.

and limitations as they might choose to prescribe.[1] These proceedings, though they wore the semblance of hostility, were hailed by many of the missionaries as the commencement of a new era; the distinction admitted in the proclamation, and the discretionary power given to the judges, encouraged a hope of further indulgence; and they resolved to deserve it, by presenting to the queen a protestation of civil allegiance, drawn in the most ample and satisfactory form. In this instrument they declared, 1. That she had a right to all that civil authority which was possessed by her predecessors; that they were bound to pay to her the same obedience in civil causes which Catholic priests had ever been bound to pay to Catholic sovereigns; and that no authority on earth could discharge them from that obligation: 2. That in cases of conspiracy and invasion, even under pretence of restoring the Catholic religion, they conceived it their duty to stand by her against all her opponents, and to reveal to her all plots and treasons which might come to their knowledge: 3. That, were any excommunication to be issued against them, on account of their performance of this duty, they should look upon it as of no effect; and lastly, that by this protestation of their loyalty, they did not trench upon that obedience which was due to the spiritual supremacy of the pontiff, but, as they were ready to shed their blood in defence of their queen and country, so would they rather lose their lives than infringe the lawful authority of the Catholic church.[2] What influence such an address might have had, we cannot tell; it never reached the hands of the queen; she was no longer in a condition to reward, or to punish.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603. — Jan. 31.

[1] Rymer, xiv. 489.

[2] Dodd, ii. 292.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

Elizabeth had surprised the nations of Europe by the splendour of her course; she was destined to close the evening of her life in gloom and sorrow. The bodily infirmities which she suffered may have been the consequences of age; her mental afflictions are usually traced by historians to regret for the execution of Essex. That she occasionally bewailed his fate, that she accused herself of precipitation and cruelty, is not improbable; but there were disclosures in his confession, to which her subsequent melancholy may with greater probability be ascribed. From that document she learned the unwelcome and distressing truth, that she had lived too long: that her favourites looked with impatience to the moment which would free them from her control; and that the very men on whose loyalty she had hitherto reposed with confidence, had already proved unfaithful to her. She became pensive and taciturn; she sat whole days by herself, indulging in the most gloomy reflections; every rumour agitated her with new and imaginary terrors; and the solitude of her court, the opposition of the Commons to her prerogative, and the silence of the citizens when she appeared in public, were taken by her for proofs that she had survived her popularity, and was become an object of aversion to her subjects. Under these impressions, she assured the French ambassador that she had grown weary of her very existence.[1]

1601. Oct. 9.

Sir John Harrington, her godson, who visited the court about seven months after the death of Essex, has described, in a private letter, the state in which he found the queen. She was altered in her features, and reduced to a skeleton. Her food was nothing

[1] Birch, ii. 505.

but manchet bread and succory pottage. Her taste for dress was gone. She had not changed her clothes for many days. Nothing could please her; she was the torment of the ladies who waited on her person. She stamped with her feet, and swore violently at the objects of her anger. For her protection she had ordered a sword to be placed by her table, which she often took in her hand, and thrust with violence into the tapestry of her chamber. About a year later he returned to the palace, and was admitted to her presence. "I found her," he says, "in a most pitiable "state. She bade the archbishop ask me if I had "seen Tyrone. I replied, with reverence, that I had "seen him with the lord deputy. She looked up "with much choler and grief in her countenance, and "said, 'O, now it mindeth me, that you was one who "'saw this man elsewhere;' and hereat she dropped "a tear, and smote her bosom. She held in her hand "a golden cup, which she often put to her lips; but, "in truth, her heart seemed too full to need more "filling."[1]

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1601. — 1602. Dec. 27.

In January she was troubled with a cold, and about the end of the month removed, on a wet and stormy day, from Westminster to Richmond. Her indisposition increased; but, with her characteristic obstinacy, she refused the advice of her physicians. Loss of appetite was accompanied with lowness of spirits, and to add to her distress, it chanced that her intimate friend, the countess of Nottingham, died.[2] Elizabeth

1603. Jan. 31.

[1] Nugæ Antiquæ, 317, 320. He adds, "She rated most grievously at noon at some one, who minded not to bring up some "matter of account. Several men have been sent to, and when "ready at hand, her highness hath dismissed them in great anger; "but who shall say 'your highness hath forgotten?'"

[2] I do not notice the story of the ring, said to have been sent by

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

now spent her days and nights in sighs and tears; or, if she condescended to speak, she always chose some unpleasant and irritating subject,—the treason and execution of Essex, or the reported project of marrying the lady Arabella into the family of Lord Hertford,[1] or the war in Ireland and the pardon of Tyrone. In the first week of March all the symptoms of her disorder were considerably aggravated; she lay during some hours in a state of stupor, rallied for a day or two, and then relapsed. The council, having learned from the physicians that her recovery was hopeless, prepared to fulfil their engagements with the king of Scots, by providing for his peaceable succession to the throne. The lord admiral, the lord keeper, and the secretary, remained with the queen at Richmond; the others repaired to Whitehall. Orders were issued for the immediate arrest and transportation to Holland of all vagrants and unknown persons found in London or Westminster; a guard was posted at the Exchequer; the great horses were brought up from Reading; the court was supplied with arms and ammunition; and several gentlemen, "hunger-starved for innovation," and therefore objects of suspicion, were conveyed prisoners to the Tower.[2]

March 10.

Essex to Elizabeth, but not delivered by the countess, who revealed her treachery on her deathbed. Had it been true, it would have been mentioned by some of those who have related the occurrences of the queen's malady.

[1] "Some great personages heare (th erle of Hertforde's younger "sonnes wife beying lately dead) propose a marriage betweene "hym and Arbella."—August 25, 1602. Beaumont, in his despatches of the beginning of the next year, says that she wished to marry Lord Hertford's grandson.—Birch, ii. But Cecil defeated these plans by confining her at Sheriff-Hutton.

[2] See a letter from Camden, Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 179; Strype, iv. 237. He mentions Baynham, Catesby, Tresham, and the two Wrights, &c. All these had been partisans of Essex; and after-

The queen, during the paroxysms of her disorder, had been alarmed at the frightful phantoms conjured up by her imagination. At length she obstinately refused to return to her bed; and sat both day and night on a stool bolstered up with cushions, having her finger in her mouth and her eyes fixed on the floor, seldom condescending to speak, and rejecting every offer of nourishment. The bishops and the lords of the council advised and entreated in vain.[1] For them all, with the exception of the lord admiral, she expressed the most profound contempt. He was of her own blood; from him she consented to accept a basin of broth; but when he urged her to return to her bed, she replied that, if he had seen what she saw there, he would never make the request. To Cecil, who asked if she had seen spirits, she answered, that it was an idle question beneath her notice. He insisted that she must go to bed, if it were only to satisfy her people. "Must!" she exclaimed, "is *must* a word to be addressed to princes? "Little man, little man, thy father, if he had been "alive, durst not have used that word; but thou art "grown presumptuous because thou knowest that I "shall die." Ordering the others to depart, she called

wards were all connected with the gunpowder plot. The count Arundel of Wardour was also confined on suspicion, but in a gentleman's house.—Ibid.

[1] The contemporary accounts differ as to the number of days that the queen spent in this manner. I prefer the narrative never yet printed of one who waited on her: "She sate for two dayes and "three nyghts on the stole redie dressed, and would never be "brought by anie of the consell to go to bed. . . . . She kept "her bed 15 dayes, besides 3 daies she sat upon the stole, and, "one day being pulled up by force, stood on her feat 15 hours." The writer was "the yonge faire Mrs. Southwell, sworne mayde of "honour" on 5 January, 1599. Her MS. is endorsed, April 1, 1607.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

the lord admiral to her, saying in a piteous tone, "My lord, I am tied with an iron collar about my "neck." He sought to console her, but she replied, "No; I am tied, and the case is altered with me."[1]

At the commencement of her illness the queen had been heard to say that she would leave the crown to the right heir; it was now deemed advisable to elicit from her a less equivocal declaration on behalf of the

March 23. king of Scots. On the last night of her life, the three lords waited upon her; and, if we may believe the report circulated by their partisans, received a favourable answer. But the maid of honour who was present has left us a very different tale. According to her narrative, the persons first mentioned to the queen by the lords were the king of France and the king of Scotland. The queen neither spoke nor stirred. The third name was that of the lord Beauchamp. At the sound her spirit was roused; and she hastily replied, "I will have no rascal's son in my seat."[2] They were the last words which she uttered. She

March 24. relapsed into a state of insensibility, and at three the next morning tranquilly breathed her last.[3] By six,

[1] I am indebted to the same fair writer for this conversation, so characteristic of the queen. Camden had heard of its conclusion, but did not understand it, attributing it to her distrust of her counsellors instead of her diseased imagination. Collum mihi obligarunt. Non habeo cui confidam. Rerum mearum facta est conversio.—Camden, 910.

[2] Lady Southwell's MS. Lord Beauchamp was the fruit of the furtive marriage between Lord Hertford and the Lady Catherine Grey, and consequently heir to the pretensions of the house of Suffolk. See note (G). This was the reason why he was named, and also why the queen used the expression "a rascal's son." Camden seems not to have known to whom she alluded, and has translated the words—"nolim ut vilis mihi succedat."—Camden, 912.

[3] Lady Southwell ends her narrative thus: "Her majesty under-"stood that secretarie Cecill had given forth that she was madd; "and therefore in her sickness did manie times say to him, 'Cicell,

the lords from Richmond joined those in London; and a resolution was taken to proclaim James as heir to the queen, both by proximity of blood and by her own appointment on her deathbed.[1]

In the judgment of her contemporaries,—and that judgment has been ratified by the consent of posterity,—Elizabeth was numbered among the greatest and the most fortunate of our princes. The tranquillity which during a reign of nearly half a century she maintained within her dominions, while the neighbouring nations were convulsed with intestine dissensions, was taken as a proof of the wisdom or the vigour of her government; and her successful resistance against the Spanish monarch, the severe injuries which she inflicted on that lord of so many kingdoms, and the spirit displayed by her fleets and armies, in expeditions to France and the Netherlands, to Spain, to the West, and even the East Indies, served to give to the world an exalted notion of her military and naval power. When she came to the throne, England ranked only among the secondary kingdoms; before

"'know that I am not mad. You must not think to make Queene "'Jane of me.' And although manie reports by Cicell's meanes "were spred how she was distracted, myselfe nor anie that weare "about her could never perceive that her speaches so well adapted "proved for a distracted mind." By "Queen Jane" she perhaps alluded to Juana, the deranged queen of Castile, whom her grandfather Henry VII. had sought to marry.

[1] See Camden, 909—911; Somers's Tracts, i. 246, 247; Carey's Memoirs, 122; Birch, ii. 506—508; D'Israeli, Curiosities of Literature, second series, iii. 107—109; Ellis, 2nd ser. iii, 194. That she made any appointment on her deathbed I do not believe; the report, however, was industriously circulated that she had named the king of Scotland her successor. Molino, ambassador to James from the state of Venice, was told that, when the question was put to whom she would leave her crown, she said not to "roghs:" that then, at the names of the kings of France and Spain, she shook her head, but at the name of the king of Scotland she made a sign expressive of her assent.—Molino's Report, MS. at Greystoke Castle.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

her death, it had risen to a level with the first nations in Europe.

Of this rise two causes may be assigned. The one, though more remote, was that spirit of commercial enterprise which had revived in the reign of Mary, and was carefully fostered in that of Elizabeth by the patronage of the sovereign and the co-operation of the great. Its benefits were not confined to the trading and seafaring classes, the two interests more immediately concerned. It gave a new tone to the public mind, and diffused a new energy through all ranks of men. Their views became expanded; their powers were called into action; and the example of successful adventure furnished a powerful stimulus to the talent and industry of the nation. Men in every profession looked forward to wealth and independence; all were eager to start in the race of improvement.

The other cause may be discovered in the system of foreign policy adopted by the ministers; a policy, indeed, which it may be difficult to reconcile with honesty and good faith, but which, in the result, proved eminently successful. The reader has seen them perpetually on the watch to sow the seeds of dissension, to foment the spirit of resistance, and to aid the efforts of rebellion in the neighbouring nations. In Scotland the authority of the crown was almost annihilated; France was reduced to an unexampled state of anarchy, poverty, and distress; and Spain beheld with dismay her wealth continually absorbed, and her armies annually perishing among the dikes and sandbanks of the Low Countries. The depression of these powers, if not a positive, was a relative benefit. As other princes descended, the English

queen appeared to rise on the scale of reputation and power.

In what proportion the merit or demerit of these and of other measures should be shared between Elizabeth and her counsellors, it is impossible to determine. On many subjects she could see only with their eyes, and hear with their ears; yet it is evident that her judgment or her conscience frequently disapproved of their advice.[1] Sometimes, after a long struggle, they submitted to her wisdom or obstinacy; sometimes she was terrified or seduced into the surrender of her own opinion; generally a compromise was effected by mutual concessions. This appears to have happened on most debates of importance, and particularly with respect to the treatment of the unfortunate queen of Scots. Elizabeth may perhaps have dissembled; she may have been actuated by jealousy or hatred; but, if we condemn, we should also remember the arts and frauds of the men by whom she was surrounded, the false information which they supplied, the imaginary dangers which they created, and the despatches which they dictated in England to be forwarded to the queen through the ambassadors in foreign courts, as the result of their own judgment and observation.[2]

It may be that the habitual irresolution of Eliza-

[1] It is moreover observed by one who had the means of judging, that, "When the busynesse did turn to better advantage, she did "moste cunningly commit the good issue to hir own honour and "understandinge; but, when ought fell oute contrarie to hir wyll "and intente, the council were in great straite to defende their owne "actinge, and not blemyshe the queen's goode judgmente. Herein "hir wyse men did oft lacke more wysdome; and the lorde treasurer "woude ofte shed a plenty of tears on any miscarriage, well know-"ynge the difficulte parte was, not so muche to mende the matter "itself as his mistresse's humor."—Harrington, Nugæ Ant. i. 357.

[2] Of these artifices many instances occur in the preceding pages. —See also Winwood, i. 20; ii. 93.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

beth was partially owing to her discovery of such practices; but there is reason to believe that it was a weakness inherent in the constitution of her mind.[1] To deliberate appears to have been her delight, to resolve her torment. She would receive advice from any, from foreigners as well as natives, from the ladies of her bedchamber no less than the lords of her council; but her distrust begot hesitation; and she always suspected that some interested motive lurked under the pretence of zeal for her service. Hence she often suffered months, sometimes years, to roll away before she came to a conclusion; and then it required the same industry and address to keep her steady to her purpose as it had already cost to bring her to it. The ministers, in their confidential correspondence, perpetually lamented this infirmity in the queen; in public they employed all their ingenuity to screen it from notice, and to give the semblance of wisdom to that which, in their own judgment, they characterised as folly.[2]

[1] Complaints of her irresolution perpetually occur in the private letters of her ministers, particularly of Sir Thomas Smith. "What "can I write, when I can have no resolution, by daily attending, for "the most part three or four times in the day. It maketh me "weary of my life. . . . I can neither get the other letters signed, "nor the letter alredy signed permitted to be sent away, but day by "day, and hour by hour, deferred till anon, sone, and to-morrow." —Smith to Burghley, 6 March, 1574. I consider this irresolution not as arising from policy, but constitutional, because she betrayed it in matters of little importance. Even in her progresses no one could be certain on what day, or to what place she would go. She is described as changing her mind almost every hour.

[2] Digges, 199, 203. Sir Thomas Smith complained to the lord treasurer that the queen's mind was "sometimes so, and sometimes "no; and in all times uncertain, and ready to stays and revocation." This her irresolution "did weary and kill her ministers, destroy her "actions, and overthrow all good designs and counsels."—Strype's Sir T. Smith, 139. Of this innumerable proofs are to be met with in the letters of that period.

Besides irresolution, there was in Elizabeth another quality equally, perhaps more, mortifying to her counsellors and favourites—her care to improve her revenue, her reluctance to part with her money. That frugality in a sovereign is a virtue deserving the highest praise could not be denied; but they contended that, in their mistress, it had degenerated into parsimony, if not into avarice. Their salaries were, indeed, low; she distributed her gratuities with a sparing hand; and the more honest among them injured their fortunes in her service; yet there were others who, by the sale of places and of patronage,[1] by grants and monopolies, were able to amass considerable wealth, or to spend with a profusion almost unexampled among subjects. The truth, however, was, that the foreign policy of the cabinet had plunged the queen into a gulf of unfathomable expense. Her connection with the insurgents in so many different countries, the support of a standing army in Holland, her long war with Spain, and the repeated attempts to suppress the rebellion of Tyrone, were continual drains upon the treasury, which the revenue of the crown, with every adventitious aid of subsidies, loans, fines, and forfeitures, was unable to supply. Her poverty increased as her wants multiplied. All her efforts were cramped; expeditions were calculated on too limited a scale, and for too short a period; and the very apprehension of

[1] The sale of patronage extended even to the ladies of the court. From a letter in Birch it appears that Lady Edmonds had refused the offer of one hundred pounds for her interest with the queen in a cause in chancery. "This ruffianry of causes," says the writer, "I am daily more and more acquainted with; which groweth by "the queen's straitness to give these women; whereby they pre-"sume thus to grange and huck causes."—Birch, i. 354. See also Ellis, 2nd ser. III, 191, 192.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

present, served only to entail on her future and enormous expense.

An intelligent foreigner had described Elizabeth, while she was yet a subject, as haughty and overbearing; on the throne she was careful to display that notion of her own importance, that contempt of all beneath her, and that courage in the time of danger, which were characteristic of the Tudors. She seemed to have forgotten that she ever had a mother, but was proud to remind both herself and others that she was the daughter of a powerful monarch, of Henry VIII. On occasions of ceremony, she appeared in all her splendour, accompanied by the great officers of state, and with a numerous retinue of lords and ladies, dressed in their most gorgeous apparel. In reading descriptions of her court, we may sometimes fancy ourselves transported into the palace of an eastern princess. When Hentzner saw her, she was proceeding on a Sunday from her own apartment to the chapel. First appeared a number of gentlemen, barons, earls, and knights of the garter; then came the chancellor with the seals, between two lords carrying the sceptre and the sword. Elizabeth followed; and wherever she cast her eyes, the spectators instantly fell on their knees. She was then in her sixty-fifth year. She wore false hair of a red colour, surmounted with a crown of gold. The wrinkles of age were imprinted on her face; her eyes were small, her teeth black, her nose prominent. The collar of the garter hung from her neck; and her bosom was uncovered, as became an unmarried queen. Her train, of great length, was borne by a marchioness; behind her followed a number of noble ladies, mostly

dressed in white; and on each side stood a line of gentlemen pensioners, with their gilt battle-axes, and in splendid uniforms.

The traveller next proceeded to the dining-room. Two gentlemen entered to lay the cloth, two to bring the queen's plate, salt, and bread. All, before they approached the table, and when they retired from it, made three genuflexions. Then came a single and a married lady, performing the same ceremonies. The first rubbed the plate with bread and salt; the second gave a morsel of meat to each of the yeomen of the guard, who brought in the different courses; and at the same time the hall echoed to the sound of twelve trumpets and two kettledrums. But the queen dined that day in private; and, after a short pause, her maids of honour entered in procession, and with much reverence and solemnity took the dishes from the table, and carried them into an inner apartment.[1]

Yet while she maintained this state in public and in the palace, while she taught the proudest of the nobility to feel the distance between themselves and their sovereign,[2] she condescended to court the good-will of the common people. In the country they had access to her at all times; neither their rudeness nor importunity appeared to offend her; she received their petitions with an air of pleasure, thanked them for their expressions of attachment, and sought the opportunity of entering into private conversation with individuals. Her progresses were undoubtedly undertaken for pleasure; but she made them subservient

[1] Hentzner, 134—136.

[2] The highest officers in the state, if they asked any favours for themselves or others, asked it on their knees.—See Syd. Pap. i. 395.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

to policy, and increased her popularity by her affability and condescension to the private inhabitants of the counties in which she made her temporary abode.[1]

From the elevation of the throne, we may now follow her into the privacy of domestic life. Her natural abilities were great: she had studied under experienced masters; and her stock of literature was much more ample than that of most females of the age. Like her sister Mary, she possessed a knowledge of five languages; but Mary did not venture to converse in Italian, neither could she construe the Greek Testament, like Elizabeth.[2] The queen is said to have excelled on the virginals, and to have understood the most difficult music. But dancing was her principal delight; and in that exercise she displayed a grace and spirit which was universally admired.[3] She retained her partiality for it to the last; few days passed in which the young nobility of the court were not called to dance before their sovereign; and the queen herself condescended to perform her part in a galliard with the duke of Nevers, at the age of sixty-nine.[4]

Of her vanity the reader will have noticed several

[1] Naunton, 88.

[2] Lansdowne MSS. No. 840. B. p. 159.

[3] Stanhope writes in 1589, "The Q. is so well as I assure you "VI or VII gallyards in a morninge besides musycke and synging, "is her ordynary exercyse."—Lodge, ii. 41. Sydney Papers, i 375, 385; ii. 203, 262. Lodge, iii. 148.

[4] "The duke of Nevers was honorablye entertayned by he "majestie; she daunced with hym, and courted hym in the best "manner; he on the other syde used many complementes, as "kissing her hand, yea and foote when she shewed hym her legg." —April 28, 1602. She opened the ball with him.—Von Raumer, ii. 180. "The queen hath been pleased to have many pleasant "discourses with him (Virginio Orisini, duke of Graciano), and to "daunce before hym." January 13, 1602.

instances in the preceding pages; there remains one of a more extraordinary description. It is seldom that females have the boldness to become the heralds of their own charms; but Elizabeth, by proclamation, announced to her people that none of the portraits which had hitherto been taken of her person did justice to the original; that at the request of her council she had resolved to procure an exact likeness from the pencil of some able artist; that it should soon be published for the gratification of her loving subjects: and that on this account she strictly forbade all persons whomsoever to paint or engrave any new portraits of her features without license, or to show or publish any of the old portraits till they had been re-formed according to the copy to be set forth by authority.[1]

The courtiers soon discovered how greedy their sovereign was of flattery. If they sought to please, they were careful to admire; and adulation the most fulsome and extravagant was accepted by the queen with gratitude, and rewarded with bounty. Neither was her appetite for praise cloyed, it seemed rather to become more craving by enjoyment. After she had passed her grand climacteric, she exacted the same homage to her faded charms as had been paid to her youth; and all who addressed her were still careful to express their admiration of her beauty in the language of oriental hyperbole.

But however highly she might think of her person, she did not despise the aid of external ornament.[2] At

[1] From the original corrected by Cecil, in 1563, and printed in the Archæologia, ii. 169, 170.

[2] "In her later time, when she showed herself in public, she was "always magnificent in apparel, supposing haply thereby that the "eyes of the people (being dazzled by the glittering aspect of these

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

her death, two, some say three, thousand dresses were found in her wardrobe, with a numerous collection of jewellery, for the most part presents which she had received from petitioners, from her courtiers on her saint's day, and at the beginning of each year, and from the noblemen and gentlemen whose houses she had honoured with her presence.[1] To the austere notions of the bishop of London, this love of finery appeared unbecoming her age, and in his sermon he endeavoured to raise her thoughts from the ornaments of dress to the riches of heaven; but she told her ladies, that if he touched upon that subject again, she would fit *him* for heaven. He should walk there without a staff, and leave his mantle behind him.[2]

" her outward ornaments) would not so easily discern the marks of " age, and decay of nature and beauty."—Ellis, 2nd ser. iii. 191. " It was commonly observed this Christmas that her majestie, when " she came to be seen, was continually painted, not only all over her " face, but her very necke and breste also." January 13, 1602. —MS. letter.

[1] In the lists of presents which she received on these occasions, we find every article of dress, even to body linen. The following account may perhaps amuse the reader. " At her first lighting at " the lord keeper's she had a fine fanne with a handle, garnisht " with diamonds; in the middle was a nosegay, and in yt a very " rich jewel, valued at 400*l.* at least. After dinner in her privy " chamber he gave her a faire paire of virginals; in her bed-chamber " he presented her with a fine gown and a juppin (petticoat), which " things were pleasing to her highness; and to grace his lordship " the more, *she of herself tooke from him* a salte, a spoone, and a " forcke of faire agatte."—Sydney Papers, i. 376. As late as December 6, before her death, she dined with Sir Robert Cecil, and accepted from him presents to the value of two thousand crowns. Carte from Beaumont's Despatches, iii. 701. " On Monday the 6th " her majestie dyned with Mr. Secretary. He gave her ten several " giftes, the most part very ritch jewells. The Q. was merrye and " well pleased; at her departure, she refused helpe to enter her " barge, whereby stumbling she fell, and a little bruised her shyns." December 15, 1602.—MS. letter.

[2] Nugæ Antiquæ, 176. " Perchance," says Harrington, " the " bishop hath never sought her highness' wardrobe, or he would " have chosen another text."

In her temper Elizabeth seemed to have inherited the irritability of her father. The least inattention, the slightest provocation, would throw her into a passion. At all times her discourse was sprinkled with oaths; in the sallies of her anger it abounded with imprecations and abuse. Nor did she content herself with words; not only the ladies about her person, but her courtiers and the highest officers in the state, felt the weight of her hands. She collared Hatton, she gave a blow on the ear to the earl marshal, and she spat on Sir Matthew Arundel, with the foppery of whose dress she was offended.[1]

To her first parliament she had expressed a wish that on her tomb might be inscribed the title of "the "virgin queen." But the woman who despises the safeguards, must be content to forfeit the reputation of chastity. It was not long before her familiarity with Dudley provoked dishonourable reports. At first they gave her pain; but her feelings were soon blunted by passion; in the face of the whole court she assigned to her supposed paramour an apartment contiguous to her own bed-chamber; and by this indecent act proved that she was become regardless of her character, and callous to every sense of shame.[2]

[1] Nugæ Ant. 167, 176.

[2] Quandra, bishop of Aquila, the Spanish ambassador, in the beginning of 1561, informs the king, that according to common belief, the queen "lived with Dudley;" that in one of his audiences Elizabeth spoke to him respecting this report, and, in proof of its improbability, showed him the situation of her apartment and bed-chamber, la disposicion de su camera y alcoba. But in a short time she deprived herself of this plea. Under the pretext that Dudley's apartment in a lower storey of the palace was unwholesome, she removed him to another, contiguous to her own chamber; una habitacion alta junto a su camera, pretestando que la que tenia era mal sana. In September of the same year these rumours derived additional credit from the change in the queen's appearance. "La

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

But Dudley, though the most favoured, was not considered as her only lover; among his rivals were numbered Hatton, and Raleigh, and Oxford, and Blount, and Simier, and Anjou; and it was afterwards believed that her licentious habits survived, even when the fire of wantonness had been quenched by the chill of age.[1] The court imitated the manners of the sovereign. It was a place in which, according to Faunt, "all enormities reigned in the highest degree,"[2] or according to Harrington, "where there was no love, but that of "the lusty god of gallantry, Asmodeus."[3]

Elizabeth firmly believed, and zealously upheld the principles of government established by her father,—the exercise of absolute authority by the sovereign, and the duty of passive obedience in the subject.[4]

"reigna (a lo que entiendo) se hace hydropica, y comienza ya a "hincharse notablemente . . . lo que se parece es que anda dis- "carda y flaca en extremo, y con un color de muerta . . . que "la marquesa di Noramton y milady Coban tengan a la reyna "por pelegrosa y hydropica, no hay duda."—See note (EE). The original despatches are at Simancas, with several letters from an English lady, formerly known to Philip (probably the marchioness of Winchester), describing in strong colours the dissolute manners both of Elizabeth and her court.—See note (EE) at the end, for an account of a supposed son of Elizabeth and Leicester.

[1] Osborn, Memoirs, 33.

[2] Birch, i. 39. In another letter he says, "The only discontent "I have, is to live where there is so little godliness and exercise of "religion, so dissolute manners and corrupt conversation generally, "which I find to be worse than when I knew the place first." August 1, 1582.—Birch, i. 25.

[3] Nugæ Antiquæ, 166. April 4, 1595.

[4] It was observed by Michele, the Venetian ambassador in the time of Mary, that "in point of fact the kings of England were "become absolute lords and masters; and that, like the grand "Turk, they had established a council similar to that of the Bashaw, "who pretty nearly in the manner of the Bashaws, assembled to- "gether, constituted themselves masters not only of the people and "public ministers, but also of ambassadors and princes; sent their "written mandates through the land; commanded in the most "authoritative manner, and required most punctual obedience, as if

The doctrine with which the lord keeper Bacon opened her first parliament, was indefatigably inculcated by all his successors during her reign, that, if the queen consulted the two houses, it was through choice, not through necessity, to the end that her laws might be more satisfactory to her people, not that they might derive any force from their assent. She possessed by her prerogative whatever was requisite for the government of the realm. She could, at her pleasure, suspend the operation of existing statutes, or issue proclamations which should have the force of law. In her opinion, the chief use of parliaments was to vote money, to regulate the minutiæ of trade, and to legislate for individual and local interests. To the lower house she granted, indeed, freedom of debate; but it was to be a decent freedom, the liberty of "saying ay or no;" and those that transgressed that decency were liable, as we have repeatedly seen, to feel the weight of the royal displeasure.[1]

A foreigner, who had been ambassador in England, informs us that under Elizabeth the administration of justice was more corrupt than under her predecessors.[2] We have not the means of instituting the comparison; but we know that in her first year the policy of Cecil substituted men of inferior rank in the place of the

"their resolutions proceeded from the king himself."—Ellis, 2nd ser. ii. 235.

[1] D'Ewes, 460, 469, 640, 644, 646, 651, 675. There is a curious instance of her interference in election in the Loseley MSS. The celebrated borough of Gatton was the property of the Copleys, and the nomination of the representatives was possessed by Mrs. Copley. But that lady was not considered as well affected; on which account the queen ordered that her own nominees, or at least well-affected persons, should he returned (p. 242).

[2] Du Yair, in Carte, iii. 702. There are many instances of applications to the queen to interfere.—Nugæ Ant. i. 118, 373. Ellis, ii. 299; 2nd ser. iii. 89.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

former magistrates; that numerous complaints were heard of their tyranny, peculation, and rapacity; and that a justice of the peace was defined in parliament to be "an animal who, for half a dozen chickens, "would dispense with a dozen laws;"[1] nor shall we form a very exalted notion of the integrity of the higher courts, if we recollect that the judges were removable at the royal pleasure, and that the queen herself was in the habit of receiving, and permitting her favourites and ladies to receive bribes as the price of her or their interference in the suits of private individuals.[2]

Besides the judicial tribunals, which remain to the present day, there were, in the age of Elizabeth, several other courts the arbitrary constitution of which was incompatible with the liberties of the subject: the court of High Commission, for the cognizance of religious offences; the court of Star-chamber, which inflicted the severest punishments for that comprehensive and undefinable transgression, contempt of the royal authority; courts of commissioners appointed occasionally for the public or private trial of offences; and the courts martial, for which the queen, from her hasty and imperious temper, manifested a strong predilection. Whatever could be supposed to have the remotest tendency to sedition, was held to subject the offender to martial law: the murder of a naval or military officer, the importation of disloyal or traitorous books, or the resort to one place of several persons who possessed

[1] D'Ewes, 661.

[2] "It is growen for a trede nowe in the courte to make meanes for "reprieves: twenty pounds for a reprieve is nothing, though it be "but for bare ten days."—Recorder Fleetwood, in Wright, ii. 247.

not the visible means of subsistence. Thus, in 1595, under the pretence that the vagabonds in the neighbourhood of London were not to be restrained by the usual punishments, she ordered Sir Thomas Wyllford to receive from the magistrates the most notorious and incorrigible of these offenders, and "to execute them upon the gallows, according to "the justice of martial law."[1]

Another and intolerable grievance was the discretionary power assumed by the queen, of gratifying her caprice or resentment by the restraint or imprisonment of those who had given her offence. Such persons were ordered to present themselves daily before the council till they should receive further notice, or to confine themselves within their own doors, or were given in custody to some other person, or were thrown into a public prison. In this state they remained, according to the royal pleasure, for weeks, or months, or years, till they could obtain their liberty by their submission, or through the intercession of their friends, or with the payment of a valuable composition.

The queen was not sparing of the blood of her subjects. The statutes inflicting death for religious opinion have been already noticed. In addition, many new felonies and new treasons were created during her reign; and the ingenuity of the judges gave to these enactments the most extensive application. In 1595 some apprentices in London conspired to release their companions, who had been condemned by the Star-chamber to suffer punishment for a riot; in 1597 a number of peasants in Oxfordshire assembled to break down inclosures and restore tillage; each of these

[1] Rymer, xvi. 279, 280.

CHAP. IX. A.D. 1603.

offences, as it opposed the execution of the law, was pronounced treason by the judges; and both the apprentices in London, and the men in Oxfordshire, suffered the barbarous death of traitors.[1]

We are told that her parsimony was a blessing to the subject, and that the pecuniary aids voted to her by parliament were few and inconsiderable, in proportion to the length of her reign. They amounted to twenty subsidies, thirty tenths, and forty fifteenths. I know not how we are to arrive at the exact value of these grants; but they certainly exceed the average of the preceding reigns; and to them must be added the fines of recusants, the profits of monopolies, and the moneys raised by forced loans; of which it is observed by Naunton, that "she left more debts unpaid, taken "upon credit of her privy seals, than her progenitors "did take, or could have taken up, that were a hundred "years before her."[2]

The historians who celebrate the golden days of Elizabeth, have described with a glowing pencil the happiness of the people under her sway. To them might be opposed the dismal picture of national misery, drawn by the Catholic writers of the same period. But both have taken too contracted a view of the subject. Religious dissension had divided the nation into opposite parties, of almost equal numbers, the oppressors and the oppressed. Under the operation of the penal statutes, many ancient and opulent families had been ground to the dust; new families had sprung up in their place; and these, as they shared the plunder, naturally eulogized the system to which they owed their wealth and their ascendancy. But their prosperity was not the prosperity of the

[1] Howell's State Trials, 1421. [2] Naunton, p. 88.

nation; it was that of one half obtained at the expense of the other.

It is evident that neither Elizabeth nor her ministers understood the benefits of civil and religious liberty. The prerogatives which she so highly prized have long since withered away; the bloody code which she enacted against the rights of conscience has ceased to stain the pages of the statute-book; and the result has proved, that the abolition of despotism and intolerance adds no less to the stability of the throne than to the happiness of the people.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A, p. 14.

In the first year of her reign, the queen gave the following explanation of her supremacy, in "an admonition to simple men, "deceived by malicious."

"Her majesty forbiddeth all manner of her subjects to give ear or "credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinis- "terly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how "by words of the said oath it may be collected, that the kings or "queens of this realm, possessors of the crown, may challenge "authority and power of ministry of divine service in the church, "wherein her said subjects be much abused by such evil-disposed "persons. For certainly her majesty neither doth, nor ever will, "challenge any other authority, than that was challenged and lately "used by the noble kings of famous memory, King Henry the "Eighth and King Edward the Sixth, which is and was of ancient "time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God, "to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born "within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, "either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other "foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them. "And if any person, that hath conceived any other sense of the "form of the said oath, shall accept the same oath with this inter- "pretation, sense, or meaning, her majesty is well pleased to accept "every such in that behalf, as her good and obedient subjects, and "shall acquit them of all manner of penalties contained in the said "act against such as shall peremptorily or obstinately refuse to take "the same oath."

This explanation satisfied many of the Puritans; the Catholics objected to it, that it seemed to give to her spiritual as well as civil authority, and at the same time excluded all spiritual jurisdiction derived from any foreign bishop.

NOTE B, p. 16.

It should be observed, that deprivation was not the only punishment inflicted on the Catholic bishops for their nonconformity. They were objects of persecution, with perhaps one exception, as long as they lived. Those who had attended in parliament were deprived immediately; the others were sent for from the country, and shared the fate of their brethren. All were placed under custody; and during the winter the sentence of excommunication was published against Heath and Thirlby, and in the summer against Bonner. By that time Tunstall of Durham, Morgan of St. David's, Ogilthorp of Carlisle, White of Winchester, and Baines of Coventry, had died of the contagious malady which prevailed. Scot of Chester, Goldwell of St. Asaph, and Pate of Worcester, found the means of retiring to the continent. Of the remaining seven, Heath, after two or three imprisonments in the Tower, was permitted to live on his own property at Cobham in Surrey, where the queen, by whom he was greatly respected, occasionally honoured him with a visit. Bonner, after a confinement of ten years, died in the Marshalsea; Watson of Lincoln remained a prisoner twenty-three years, and died in Wisbeach Castle. Thirlby of Ely lived in the custody of Archbishop Parker, and Bourne of Bath and Wells in that of Dr. Carew, dean of Exeter. Turberville of Exeter, and Pool of Peterborough, were suffered to remain at their own houses, on their recognizances not to leave them without license. Feckenham, abbot of Westminster, passed from the Tower to the custody of the bishop of London, then to that of the bishop of Winchester, and was at last confined in Wisbeach Castle.

NOTE C, p. 18.

Archbishop Parker.

The elevation of Dr. Parker to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury was an important event in English history. On that account it will be my object in this note to point out the circumstances which at first retarded his consecration, and the several controversies to which that consecration afterwards gave birth.

It was originally intended that his consecration should take place in the Ember-week of September, 1559. Hence on September 9 a commission was issued to Tunstall, bishop of Durham, Bourne of Bath and Wells, Pool of Peterborough, and Kitchen of Landaff, and to Barlow and Scorey, bishops once of Bath and Chichester, but deprived under Queen Mary, commanding them, or four of them, on their allegiance, to meet, and confirm and consecrate Dr. Parker to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. Now the first four of these were bishops in the actual exercise of episcopal jurisdiction, so that if they had obeyed the queen's mandate, the confirmation

and consecration of the new archbishop would have been vested with the formalities required by the statute of the 25th of Henry VIII. But Tunstall, Bourne, and Pool refused to obey; they were deprived and imprisoned; and Kitchen remained the only diocesan bishop in the kingdom.

The queen was now advised to issue a second commission, making up the requisite number of prelates from deprived or suffragan bishops, and healing all defects, and removing all disqualifications by what might be called a sanatory clause, proceeding from her supreme authority, and justified by the urgency of the case. On the approach of the Ember-week in December such a commission was accordingly issued (December 6) to Kitchen of Landaff, to Barlow, formerly of Bath, now elect of Chichester, Scorey, formerly of Chichester, now elect of Hereford, and Coverdale, formerly of Exeter, to the suffragans of Bedford and Thetford, and to Bale, bishop of Ossory in Ireland. This commission was exactly of the same authority and to the same import as the former, but in it was introduced the sanatory clause devised by the civilians. Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, suffragan of Bedford, having consented to act under it, Parker was confirmed (Dec. 9), and consecrated (Dec. 17) by these four.

Still doubts were entertained of the legality of his consecration and the question was at last brought to an issue by the contest between Horne, the new bishop of Winchester, and Bonner, the deprived bishop of London, then a prisoner in the Marshalsea. The statute of the 1st of Elizabeth, c. 1, had authorized the bishops to offer the oath of supremacy to clergymen within their respective bishoprics, and subjected the refusers to take it to the penalties of a præmunire. Now Bonner, though deprived of his bishopric, was still a clergyman, and the Marshalsea, though a prison, was situate within the diocese of Winchester. Horne, therefore, summoned Bonner to take the oath, and certified his refusal into the court of Queen's Bench. Bonner, under the advice of Plowden, the celebrated lawyer, pleaded not guilty, for several reasons; one of which was, that the person by whom the oath had been offered to him was no bishop. After a long argument in Serjeants' Inn, all the judges agreed that Bonner had a right to an inquiry before a jury as to the matter of fact, whether Horne, at the time when he offered the oath, was or was not a bishop in the eye of the law. On what grounds Bonner's plea would have been sustained, we know not; the trial was prevented; but, if we may judge from the act of parliament which followed, it would have been maintained that he had not received a legal consecration from the new archbishop, because that very prelate's consecration had been illegal, through the defect of jurisdiction in his consecrators, and the illegality of the ordinal according to which he had been consecrated (on the illegality of that ordinal, both Parker and Cecil were agreed.—See Strype's Parker, p. 40). The ministers, however, very adroitly freed themselves from the difficulty by an act of parliament "declaring the manner

"of making bishops and archbishops in this kingdom to be good, "perfect, and lawful." It begins with a very long preamble in justification of the queen's conduct. She was empowered by law to appoint to bishoprics and archbishoprics by her letters patent; she had ordered the persons so appointed to be confirmed and consecrated according to the ordinal at the end of the book of Common Prayer, which book had been approved by parliament; and she had by an especial clause dispensed with all causes and doubts of any imperfection and disability that might or could be objected against the same, as by her letters patent still remaining of record (that is, on the rolls of Chancery) will appear. After this preamble it is enacted—1. That in all ordinations and consecrations, the ordinal of Edward VI. shall be followed; 2. That all acts and things already done in the confirmation, investing, and consecration of bishops by virtue of the queen's letters patent, shall be judged good and perfect to all intents and purposes; 3. That all persons consecrated in that manner shall be had to have been truly and validly consecrated—but with a proviso; 4. That a stop be put to all prosecutions for the refusal of the oath of supremacy, hitherto offered by the new bishops, and that all tenders of the said oath hitherto made by them should be void and of none effect or validity in the law.—Stat. of Realm, iv. 484. By this act, passed in the eighth of the queen's reign, the sovereign's authority was preserved in full force, the legal validity of the previous consecrations was established, and the deprived bishops were saved from the penalties of præmunire with which they had been threatened by the zeal or the enmity of their successors.

But no parliamentary enactment could set at rest the question respecting the theological validity of these ordinations. We are told, and that too on apparent authority (Fuller, ix. 62; Heylin, p. 121), that from Bow Church the commissioners, who had confirmed the election of Parker, proceeded to dinner at a neighbouring inn, the Nag's Head, much frequented by the country clergy on their arrival in London. This fact, if it be a fact, may account for the origin of a story afterwards circulated, that, during the dinner, a messenger arrived from Bonner forbidding Kitchen to exercise any diocesan authority in the bishopric of London, on which Scorey, jocularly leaving his seat, bade the bishops elect kneel down, placed a bible on the head of each, and bade them rise up consecrated bishops. How Kitchen and Scorey happened to be present (for the records show that they never acted together), or what concern the bishops elect had with the confirmation of Parker (for *they* were confirmed, not by the commissioners, but by Parker himself), is not stated. But the dinner appears to have given rise to some story, which at first was privately whispered, after some years became by repetition more consistent and more widely known, and acquired strength and credit in proportion as it receded from its origin, till in the beginning of the next century it was boldly supported by writers, who maintained that the established hierarchy

derived its existence from the mummery said to have been practised at the Nag's Head by the jocular Bishop Scorey. It will not excite surprise, if such statements led to a long and acrimonious controversy.

To meet the Nag's Head fable, appeal was made to the archbishop's register. That register opens with some documents appertaining to his promotion, and a long narrative comprising the whole process of his consecration; a narrative remarkable for the minuteness of detail into which it enters, and the irreverent language in which it occasionally speaks of the officiating prelates, whom it designates by the names of plain John Scorey, Miles Coverdale, &c. From this document we learn that the time appointed for the consecration was a little before six in the morning of Sunday, the 17th of December; the place appointed, the archiepiscopal chapel at Lambeth. The consecrators were the four prelates by whom the election of Parker had been confirmed, Barlow and Hodgkins, who had been bishops under Henry VIII., and Scorey and Coverdale, who had been bishops under Edward VI. The witnesses consisted of many of the new bishops elect, the chief officers of Parker's ecclesiastical and household establishments, and Thomas Willet and John Incent, notaries public, to whom we ought perhaps to attribute the document itself. There exists a copy of the same document in the State Paper Office (Tierney's Dodd, ii. cclxxxiv.), and another in a contemporary hand (often supposed to be the original notarial instrument from which the entry was made in the register), still in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, to which it was left a legacy, with other papers, by the archbishop himself. A fac-simile of this instrument was published by the Cambridge Antiquarian Society in 1841.

To this testimony of the register what could the champions of the Nag's Head story oppose? They had but one resource,—to deny its authenticity; to pronounce it a forgery. But there was nothing to countenance such a supposition. The most experienced eye could not discover in the entry itself, or the form of the characters, or the colour of the ink, the slightest vestige of imposture. Moreover, the style of the instrument, the form of the rite, and the costumes attributed to the prelates, were all in keeping, redolent of the theology taught in the schools of Strasburgh and Geneva. Besides, if external confirmation were wanting, there was the archbishop's diary or journal, a parchment roll, in which he had been accustomed to enter the principal events of his life, and in which, under the date of the 17th of December, ann. 1559, is found—Consecratus sum in archiepiscopum Cantuarien. Heu! heu! Domine Deus, in quæ tempora servasti me! Another confirmation, to which no objection can be reasonably opposed, occurs in the Zurich letters, in which we find Sampson informing Peter Martyr on the 6th of January, 1560, that Dr. Parker had been consecrated archbishop of Canterbury during the preceding month.

In the course of this controversy, the answer to one objection

frequently produced a new subject of debate. According to the register, a William Barlow held the office of consecrating prelate. Who was he? Barlow had been a regular canon of St. Osyth's, distinguished by the boldness and bitterness of his writings at a more early period, and afterwards a great favourite with Cromwell, vicar-general to Henry VIII. About the end of 1535 he was sent from his priory of Bisham in the company of Lord William Howard, on a mission, partly political, partly religious, to James V. of Scotland, where he was successfully opposed by those "pestilent limbs "of the devil," the Scottish bishops. Soon after his arrival there, he was elected bishop of St. Asaph, in Wales, and, whilst he still remained in Scotland, before he had been consecrated, or had taken possession of his see, he was transferred, probably at the instance of his patron, from the diocese of St. Asaph to that of St. David's by "free transmutation—per liberam transmutationem."—Rymer, xiv. 570. In the present stage of the controversy it was asked whether Barlow had been consecrated as well as transmuted, for both parties agreed that an unconsecrated prelate could not confer consecration. Now it happened most vexatiously that no record of his consecration was known to exist. Though searches were repeatedly made in every likely repository, no traces of it could be found, nor, I believe, has any allusion or reference to it been discovered to the present day in any ancient writer or document. Still the absence of proof is no proof of non-consecration. No man has ever disputed the consecration of Gardiner of Winchester; yet he was made bishop whilst on a mission abroad, and his consecration is involved in as much darkness as that of Barlow. When, therefore, we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a brother with the other consecrated bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated bishop, summoned equally with them to parliament and convocation, taking his seat among them according to his seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both church and state, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body.

However, setting Barlow aside, there still remained the very important question, whether the Lambeth rite was of itself sufficient to constitute a Christian bishop; for the reader is not to suppose that the consecration of Dr. Parker was celebrated according to the form in which episcopal consecrations are performed at the present time. In Edward's reign, Archbishop Cranmer had "devised" an ordinal, in conformity with his own Calvinistic notions respecting the episcopal character. It seems, however, not to have harmonized perfectly with the notions which Barlow and his coadjutors had acquired from their foreign masters. Omitting, therefore, part of it, they consecrated the new archbishop in the following manner. Placing their hands upon his head, they admonished him thus: "Remember that

"thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of "hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, "and love and of soberness." How, it was asked, could this monition make a bishop? It bore no immediate connection with the episcopal character. It designated none of the peculiar duties incumbent on a bishop. It was as fit a form for the ordination of a parish clerk, as of the spiritual ruler of a diocese. Parliament in the eighth of Elizabeth ordered that the ordinal devised under Edward VI. should be observed, which ordinal continued in force till the convocation of 1662 made the following alteration in the form to be thenceforth observed: "Receive the Holy Ghost *for the* "*office and work of a bishop in the church of God, committed unto* "*thee by the imposition of our hands in the name of the Father, and* "*of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:* and remember that thou stir "up the grace of God which *is given to thee by this imposition of our* "*hands;* for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, "and love, and soberness." This addition was manifestly a great improvement, inasmuch as it imparted to the rite that episcopal character which it had hitherto wanted; but to have been of real use, it ought to have been introduced at the same time with the line of prelates to whom it applied. By Charles II. it was approved, and at his recommendation was established by parliament as the legal form of ordaining bishops in the church of England.—Statutes of Realm, v. 364.

NOTE D, p. 33.

Elizabeth's objections to Knox arose from two causes; the antipathy to the English liturgy which he had manifested at Frankfort and Geneva; and his doctrine respecting the incapacity of women to exercise the sovereign authority. This he had published in his "First blast of the trumpet against the monstrous regiment "(government) of women;" to which he had threatened to add two other blasts still more sharp and vehement. In the first, he taught that the rule of a woman was "repugnant to nature, a con-"tumely to God, a thing most contrarious to his revealed will and "approved ordinance, and finally the subversion of all equity and "justice;" in the second blast he intended to teach, that governors ought to be chosen according to God's ordinance; that no manifest idolater, no notorious transgressor of God's holy word, should be promoted to any regiment; that no oaths nor promises could bind the people to obey and maintain tyrants against God and his known truth; and that those who had appointed a governor might lawfully depose and punish him, if he showed himself unworthy of the regiment over the people of God.—Strype, 122. Knox, Hist. 478. At the time of the first blast, Mary of England was alive; nor did he foresee the elevation to the throne of another woman, a friend to

the Reformation. To recover her favour he acknowledged to her and to Cecil, that she was an exception from the general rule; that her whole life had been a miracle, which proved that she had been chosen by God; that the office, which was unlawful to other women, was lawful to her; and that on these grounds he was ready to obey and maintain her authority.—Strype, 121. Elizabeth did not suffer herself to be cajoled by the flattery of the apostle, nor persuaded by the policy of Throckmorton, who interceded in his favour. "Con-"sidering what Knokes is hable to do in Scotland, which is very "muche, all this turmoil there being by him stirred as it is, it "shuld stand your majesty in stede his former faultes were for-"gotten."—Forbes, 130. Cecil was obliged to caution his correspondents not to mention the name of Knox. "Of all others, "Knoxees name, if it be not Goodman's, is most odiose here: "and therefore I wish no mention of hym hither."—Cecil to Sadler and Croft (Sadler, i. 532).

Goodman had been joint minister with Knox at Geneva, and had published, in 1558, his celebrated treatise—"How superior powers "ogbt to be obeyd, and wherin they may lawfully by God's worde "be disobeyed and resisted." In it he repeated the doctrine of his associate respecting the political incapacity of females, and taught that kings and magistrates might lawfully be deposed and punished by their subjects, if they became wicked or tyrannical. He joined Knox in Scotland; but, though he had many friends, it was long before Elizabeth would allow him to set his foot in England. At his return, he submitted to recant his obnoxious doctrine, first in 1565, and again in 1571.—Strype, i. 126; ii. 95, 96.

As soon as Elizabeth ascended the throne, the exiles, after some consultation, appointed Aylmer to appease the queen, by writing in favour of female government against Knox and Goodman. His tract was entitled "An Harborowe for faithful and trewe subjectes "against the late blowne blaste concerning the government of "women. MDLIX. at Strasborowe the 26th of April." This tract made his fortune; the queen gave him preferment in the church, and in due time he was raised to the see of London. In his work he had advised the prelates to be content with "priest-"like," and not to seek after "prince-like fortunes;" but the bishop forgot the lessons of the exile; and, being reminded of his own doctrine, he replied, "When I was a child I spake as a child, "I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became "a man, I put away childish things."—1 Cor. xiii. 2. Strype's Aylmer, 147, 177.

NOTE E, p. 53, and F, p. 56.

Whitaker, in his vindication of Mary, persuaded himself that he had made an important discovery with respect to this treaty. In a

long and laboured note, appended to his third volume (p. 463), he contends that the treaty is a forgery, executed with the connivance of Cecil and Wotton, for the purpose of depriving Francis and Mary of all real authority within the kingdom of Scotland. The same opinion has been recently maintained, and enforced with additional arguments, by Mr. Chalmers, in his valuable Life of Mary (vol. ii. p. 411). Feeling myself obliged to dissent from these authorities, I may be allowed to state the reasons why I believe in the authenticity of the treaty.

No one acquainted with the real history of the time can, in my opinion, doubt of the following facts: 1. That an accord or treaty of some description or other was negotiated at Edinburgh, between the lords of the Congregation and Montluc and Randan, the French commissioners.—See Haynes's State Papers, i. 329, 331—341.

2. That the substance of that treaty, as it was communicated by Cecil and Wotton to Elizabeth (July 6, Haynes, 351) agrees with the articles of the treaty, the authenticity of which is now called in question; whence it follows that, if the forgery was committed at all, it was committed at the very time when the real treaty was concluded.—Haynes, 351, 355.

3. That within a month afterwards the treaty, now said to be a forgery, was laid before the Scottish parliament, and was acted upon by it as if it were a real treaty.—Keith, 152.

4. That the same treaty was sent to France by the lord of St. John's, with a request to the king and queen to ratify it as if it were a real treaty.—Keith, ibid.; Hardwicke State Papers, i. 126.

5. That they refused the ratification, on the ground that the Scottish lords had not complied with the obligations prescribed by it.—Ibid. 126—138.

Now these facts seem to me to place the authenticity of the instrument beyond contradiction. Would Cecil and Wotton have dared to deceive their own sovereign by palming on her a spurious in place of a real treaty? Would the fabricators of the supposed forgery have ventured to lay it immediately before the parliament, in which sat many persons both able and interested to detect the fraud? Would they have had the effrontery to ask the ratification of a forgery from the king and queen, who must have had the real treaty in their possession? Or would Francis and Mary have hesitated to ground their refusal of ratification on the fraud, if any fraud had existed? I see not how these questions can be satisfactorily answered in the hypothesis maintained by Whitaker.

But the reader will ask, what are the reasons which induced him to pronounce the treaty a forgery? 1. The originals do not exist either in the archives of France or those of Scotland. How comes it that we have only an attested copy preserved by Cecil? But surely the non-existence of the originals at present does not prove that they did not exist formerly. As the treaty was not ratified, the originals may have been destroyed by order of Mary.

2. The commission before the treaty is dated in the sixteenth

instead of the eighteenth year of Mary. This anachronism is, in the judgment of Whitaker, a convincing proof of the forgery. To me it appears to prove nothing more than the error of the copyist. Had Cecil and Wotton, or the lord James and Maitland, forged the commission, we may be assured that they would have been careful to date it correctly.

3. But the commission contradicts itself. On the 2nd of June, it orders the ambassadors to proceed to the frontiers of Scotland, though the French ministers must have known that they were already preparing for that journey, in virtue of a previous commission, dated May 2. The answer is easy. The first commission did not empower them to treat with the Scots; to remedy this defect, they wrote for a second commission, and desired it might be sent after them.

The other arguments adduced against the authenticity of the treaty are all founded on mere conjectures, and appear to me of no force whatever when opposed to the facts already mentioned.

NOTE G, p. 85.

By the adoption of the thirty-nine articles the seal was put to the Reformation in England. A new church was built on the ruins of the old; and it will be the object of this note to point out to the reader how far these churches agreed, how far they disagreed, in their respective creeds.

1. They both taught that there is but one God: that in the unity of the Godhead are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that the Son took to himself the nature of man; that he offered himself a sacrifice for all sin of man, both original and actual; and that his is the only name whereby man must be saved.

2. They equally admitted the three symbols, usually denominated the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds.

3. They equally revered the holy Scriptures as the true word of God. But here they began to differ. 1. Several books of the Jewish Scriptures were pronounced apocryphal by the new, while they were admitted as canonical by the old church. 2. The former maintained that all doctrines, taught by Christ and his apostles, had been recorded in the Scriptures; the latter that many things, such as the baptism of infants, the obligation of observing the Sunday instead of the Sabbath, &c., had been taught by Christ or his apostles, and yet had not been recorded in the Scriptures, but were known only by tradition.

4. Both agreed that "the church hath a right to decree rites and "ceremonies, and hath authority in controversies of faith;" but the articles seemed to nullify this authority by restrictions. The church could decide nothing but what is contained in the Scriptures; could

not assemble in general council without the command and will of princes; and, when so assembled, was liable to err, and had actually erred. The old church allowed no such authority to princes, and maintained that Christ, according to his promises in the Scripture, would so watch over his church assembled in general council, as not to suffer it to fall into any essential error, either in faith or discipline.

5. Both equally required vocation and mission in their ministers; and both intrusted the government of the church to bishops, as the highest order in the hierarchy. But the old church, while it admitted no ecclesiastical authority in the prince as prince, acknowledged in the bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, a primacy of order and jurisdiction throughout the universal church; the new refused to the bishop of Rome any jurisdiction within the realm, and considered the sovereign as supreme, even in ecclesiastical government.

6. Both equally taught that the justification of the sinner cannot be acquired or deserved by any natural effort, and that it is given gratis on account of the merits of Christ; but in this they differed, or perhaps seemed to differ, that the one inculcated justification by faith only, the other, in addition to faith, required both hope and charity.

7. That the sacraments are efficacious signs of grace, by which God worketh invisibly in us, was taught by both; but the seven sacraments of the Catholics,—viz., baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, holy order, extreme unction, and matrimony, were by the articles reduced to two,—viz., baptism and the eucharist.

8. The most important points in which they differed regarded the eucharist. The English reformers taught that in the sacrament "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, only after a heavenly "and spiritual manner;" the Catholics, "after a real though "spiritual and sacramental manner;" the former declared that the doctrine of transubstantiation could not be proved from the words of Scripture; the latter, that it necessarily followed from the words of Scripture—the first, that the communion ought to be administered to laymen under both kinds, according to the institution and the command of Christ; the others, that communion under both kinds does not follow from the institution, and is not prescribed by the command of Christ.

9. By the articles the mass was pronounced a blasphemous forgery, on the ground that there can be no other sacrifice for sin than that which was offered upon the cross; according to the Catholics, the mass is a true propitiatory sacrifice, commemorative of that formerly offered on the cross.

10. The articles condemned, but in general terms, and without any explanation, the doctrines of—1, purgatory; 2, pardons; 3, the veneration and adoration of relics and images; and 4, the invocation of the saints. The Catholics taught—1. That the souls of men who depart this life, neither so wicked as to deserve the punishment

of hell, nor so pure as to be admitted there, "where nothing defiled "can enter," are immediately after death placed in a state of purgation; 2. That pardons of the temporal punishment of sin, called indulgences, are useful and to be retained; 3. That it is lawful to show an inferior respect or veneration to the remains of holy persons, and to the images of Christ and his saints; 4. That it is also lawful to solicit the departed saints to join their prayers with ours, "to beg for us benefits from God through his Son Jesus Christ, our "only Saviour and Redeemer."—Con. Trid. Sess. xxv.

NOTE H, p. 100.

1. By act of parliament the crown had been limited to the three children of Henry VIII., Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and, failing them, to such persons as the king, by his last will, signed with his own hand, should appoint.

2. After his death, a will, purporting to be his, was produced; and by it the succession was limited, after the heirs of his own children, to the heirs of his second sister, Mary, wife of the duke of Suffolk, to the exclusion of the heirs of his eldest sister, Margaret, married first to James king of Scotland, and afterward to Archibald earl of Angus.

3. Considerable doubt was entertained of the authenticity of the will attributed to Henry. Under Mary it was pronounced spurious by the privy council; by Elizabeth it was never suffered to be mentioned.

4. By hereditary descent, Mary of Scotland was the next claimant as the representative of her grandmother, Margaret, and after her the countess of Lennox, as the daughter of the same Margaret, by her second husband, the earl of Angus.

5. The Protestants dreaded the succession of Mary, on account of her religion. To remove her, it was contended that, by the law of England, no person born of foreign parents, and in a foreign realm, could inherit in England; and therefore that, as she came under this description, being born in Scotland, and the daughter of King James and Mary of Lorrain, the succession belonged to the next of blood, the countess of Lennox, whose mother was an Englishwoman, and who had been born in England. To this it was victoriously answered, that the law in question was confined to private inheritances, and did not regard the succession to the crown.

6. The partisans of the house of Suffolk maintained that the objection was valid; and that it applied not only to the Scottish queen, but also to the countess of Lennox. They argued that, when the father and mother were of different conditions, the child followed the father; and that, as he was a foreigner, his daughter was a foreigner too; nor did it matter that she was born at Harbottle in England, for the earl and his wife did not dwell here as subjects

to the king, but were merely strangers on their passage through the kingdom.

7. Elizabeth herself would give no opinion, nor suffer others to give any opinion, on these pretensions. Sensible of the insecurity of her own claim, she looked with a jealous eye on all who had any pretensions to the succession, and seemed to fear that, if the right were decided in favour of any person, that person might supersede her on the throne.

8. Mary, the second daughter of Henry VII., from whom the house of Suffolk claimed, left two daughters, Frances and Eleanor. Of the three daughters of Frances, one only, by name Catherine, left issue. She was first married to the eldest son of the earl of Pembroke, and afterwards divorced from him. On the 10th of August, 1561, it was discovered that she was pregnant. She declared that she had been married privately to Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford; but Elizabeth, who pretended to believe that "since the death of the lady Jane (her sister) she had been privie "to many great practices and purposes" (Haynes, 369), committed her to the Tower; though Cecil asserts that "he could find nothing "in it." A child was born (1561, August 17, ut multi putant ex stupro, sed ut ipsi dicunt, ex legitimis nuptiis. Ea res turbavit animos multorum. Nam si sint veræ nuptiæ, puer, qui susceptus est, alitur ad spem regni. O nos miseros, qui non possumus scire, sub quo domino victuri sumus.—Jewell to P. Mar. 7 Feb. 1562. Burn. iv. 568). Hertford was sent for from France; and the queen ordered the archbishop to inquire into the validity of their union. "Nobody appeared privy to the marriage, nor to the love, but "maids" (Hardwicke Papers, i. 177); and the archbishop pronounced them both guilty of an illicit intercourse, and adjudged them to be punished according to the queen's pleasure (February, 1562). Elizabeth ordered them to be confined in separate parts of the Tower; but by the connivance of the warders, they met again; a second child was the consequence; and Hertford was condemned in the Star-chamber to imprisonment, and to three fines of five thousand pounds each for three offences,—the violation of a maid of royal descent, the breaking of his prison to visit her, and the repetition of the first offence. Catherine continued a prisoner till her death, which happened at Sir Owen Hopton's house, whither she had been removed on account of the plague, on the 26th of January, 1568. Hertford's confinement lasted nine years.—Camd. 89. Ellis, ii. 272—290. Nares, ii. 347. There is no proof that the marriage was ever established. In 1606 Lord Beauchamp obtained a grant of the earldom and barony, to take effect after the death of the earl; and his son, in the patent restoring him to the dukedom of Somerset, is called heir male to the first duke.—See Mr. Hallam's Const. Hist. i. 397.

Hales, clerk of the hanaper, was the legal adviser of Hertford. In his zeal to serve his client, he committed himself so far as to write a book, in which he attempted to prove the claim of the house of

Suffolk to the succession, and that of course the next heir was the lady Catherine. Cecil, from motives of policy or interest, supported, as far as he durst, the same opinion; Bacon was less cautious, and even assisted Hales. The queen sent the latter to the Tower; and, to show her displeasure to Bacon, excluded him from the council, and ordered him to confine himself to the business of the Chancery.

9. If the succession were in the house of Suffolk, it undoubtedly belonged to the lady Catherine, as representative of her mother, the eldest daughter of the French queen. In parliament, however, there appeared a party which supported the claim of Margaret, married to Ferdinando Stanley, son to the earl of Derby, as the representative of the lady Eleanor, her mother, who was second daughter of the French queen. On what ground this party excluded the lady Catherine, I know not.

10. There was another party in parliament which maintained the exclusion of the issue of Margaret, the Scottish queen, for the reasons already alleged; and also the exclusion of the issue of Mary, the French queen, because, as they asserted, she could not be the lawful wife of the duke of Suffolk, he having at the time of his marriage a lawful wife living, of the name of Mortimer.—Haynes, 412. Hence they sought the true heir among the descendants of the house of York, and fixed on the earl of Huntingdon, sprung from George duke of Clarence, brother to Edward IV. His mother was daughter to Lord Montague, and granddaughter to the countess of Salisbury, executed by Henry VIII. The very mention of a successor alarmed the jealousy of Elizabeth; and the earl, fearful of becoming the object of her displeasure, wrote to the earl of Leicester, maintaining his own loyalty, and soliciting the protection of that favourite.—See the letter in the Hardwicke Papers, i. 187.

NOTE I, p. 108.

On July 13th an interesting conversation took place between Mary and Randolph respecting her intended marriage with Darnley. The ambassador had hinted at her ingratitude in not following the advice of Elizabeth after so many promises to do so. "Your mistress," she replied, "went about but to abuse me; and so was I "warned out of England, France, and other parts; and, when I "found it so indeed, I thought I would no longer stay upon her "fair words, but, being as free as she is, I would stand to my own "choice; for, if your mistress would have used me as I trusted she "would have done, she cannot have a daughter of her own that "would have been more obedient to her than I would have been; "and yet I desire to live in that peace and amity with her that be"fore I did. Let not her be offended with my marriage, no more "than I am with hers; and for the rest I will abyde such fortune "as God may send me." Randolph answered that his mistress had frequently shown her good will towards the Scottish queen; that

Mary had offered to follow Elizabeth's advice, and yet had forfeited the benefit by falling in love with a man at first sight. This was an offence which his mistress had a right to make known; she did not claim any authority over Mary, but gave advice because it was asked, and the adoption of it had been promised. "It must now, however," said the queen, "be with me as it may be; and I pray you tell me "what would the queen my good sister that I should do." He replied, "Send home the lord of Lennox and the lord Darnley." "That," said Mary, "may not be. Is there no other way but "that?" "That," he replied, "is the best. But what if your "majesty would alter your religion?" "What would that do?" she asked. "Peradventure," said he, "it would somewhat move "her majesty to allow the sooner of your marriage." "What "would you," she exclaimed, "that I should make merchandise of "my religion, or frame myself to your ministers' wills? It cannot "be so." Randolph then advised her to beware in time, and not compel Elizabeth to take severe measures in defence of her own honour. Mary concluded by saying, "You can never persuade me "that I have failed to your mistress, but rather she to me, and some "incommodity it will be to her to lose my amity, as the loss of hers "will be to me. Yet I will refuse to do nothing that well I may." —Rand. to Cecil, July 16, 1565. Stevenson, 122—124.

NOTE J, p. 169, and K, p. 190.

Whether the letters produced by Murray at York and Westminster were genuine or not, is a question which has given birth to a voluminous controversy. If the reader wish to see it treated at length, he may have recourse to Goodall, Tytler, Robertson, Hume, Stuart, Whitaker, and Laing. I shall only subjoin a few remarks.

1. From the mere perusal of the letters, the reader would conclude that Bothwell and Mary were the only conspirators. Now if she were an accomplice, she must have known how deeply Maitland and Morton were concerned in the plot; and yet with respect to them, she is as guarded in the letters as if they had been written by the murderers themselves. I observe the same in all the confessions taken previously to the conferences at York and Westminster. There Maitland and Morton are never mentioned. But after the conferences, Maitland deserted the party; then the confession of Paris was taken; and then for the first time we meet with hints of the guilt of Maitland. All this wears the appearance of fraud.

2. When the casket was exhibited before the English commissioners, it contained, not only letters, but contracts and sonnets, which Morton swore he had found in it when it first came into his possession. Yet in the preceding December, nothing but letters were said to be contained in it, or were produced from it before either the council or the parliament. How came the contracts and sonnets to be then suppressed, if they existed at all?

Mr. Laing pretends that the objection arises from ignorance. Englishmen are not aware that almost all kinds of writing were called letters in the Scottish dialect. But, admitting this, it may be asked whether any writings but epistolary correspondence were called "*privie* lettars." They were privy letters, on which the act of council and the act of parliament were founded.

3. On the 4th of December, Murray and twenty-seven privy councillors described these letters as written and *subscribed* by the queen; ten days later the parliament represented them, not as subscribed at all by her (nor was it ever afterwards pretended), but as "written halelie" (wholly) with her own hand. This alteration furnishes another ground of suspicion.

I shall not notice the answers of Hume and Robertson. Mr. Laing suggests that *and* is a mistake of the copyist for *or*, and that it was in the original "written or subscribed with her own hand;" in the same manner as Murray and his associates, in their declaration make oath, that they are written *or* subscribed by her.—Goodall, ii. 92.

This appears to me the best answer that has yet been given. It does not, however, entirely do away the difficulty. That some correction in the act of council was thought necessary, preparatory to its being laid before parliament, appears from the introduction of the word "halelie," and the omission of the word "subscribed;" and it should be observed that, in the passage quoted from Murray, the letters are expressly distinguished from the contracts and sonnets. No such distinction is to be found in the act of council.

4. There is a strong chronological objection, which Mr. Laing labours in vain to remove. The two first letters are said to have been written on the 23rd and 24th of January, and to have been answered from Edinburgh by Bothwell on the 24th and 25th. The last answer was written by him after dinner. Now, if we believe Murray's Diary, Bothwell left Edinburgh to go into Liddesdale on the night of the 24th, and returned only on the 28th. Here is evidently a contradiction.

To solve the difficulty, Mr. Laing pretends that Bothwell did not leave Edinburgh till the evening of the 25th; that he then went in company with Maitland to consult Morton at Whittingham; and that they returned together on the 28th. To conceal their conference, it was thought best to say that they had been into Liddesdale, and to antedate the time of their departure, on account of the greater length of the journey.

But, 1. If this be true, what credit can be given to any documents produced by such witnesses? The men who could falsify the diary to screen Morton and Maitland, might equally falsify letters to convict Mary. 2. The whole is a fiction. The earl of Bedford on the 23rd, wrote to Elizabeth, that the meeeting at Whittingham had already taken place. Of course the 25th is several days too late.

5. Mary is represented as writing two of the letters, one on a

very trifling subject, on the two nights that she remained at the house of Kirk-o'-field. This almost exceeds belief. Bothwell had but just left her; he was gone no further than his lodgings in Holyrood House; he would be in her company in the morning; and yet the queen, instead of retiring to rest, sits up to write to him letters of no consequence, and sends a servant after midnight to awaken him out of his sleep, and deliver them into his hands!

6. If Mary wrote the letters at all, it would be in the French language. It has been proved beyond contradiction, that the French letters which we have are not originals, but translations. This was thought a most victorious proof of the forgery. But Mr. Laing has victoriously refuted it, by showing that our French letters are not copies of the original French letters, but, by the avowal of the editor, translations made by him from a Latin translation. The letters had been "traduites entierement en Latin;" and the editor "n'ayant connoisance de la langue Escossoise, aima mieux exprimer "tout ce qu'il avoit trouvé en Latin."—Apud Laing, i. 270. There is little probability, therefore, that the original French letters will ever be laid before the public. A copy of one alone has been discovered and published by Laing, from the State Paper Office (ii. 102). It is one of the least important, No. IV., but much more intelligible than any of the translations, and of a nature to make us regret the loss of the others.

7. For my own part I have little doubt that the letters were for the most part written by Mary. But, in this hypothesis, two questions will arise, to which her adversaries will not be able to give satisfactory answers. 1. To whom were they written? Those in the casket were exhibited without any address. For aught we know, they might be written to different persons. Two of them appear to me to have been letters sent by her long before to Darnley. 2. Were they originally written, as they afterwards appeared? It was easy to collect several of the queen's letters, to omit some passages, alter others, insert hints here and there, and by describing them as written to Bothwell, and on particular occasions, to give to them a character of criminality, which they did not originally possess. This appears to me to have been the meaning of the queen's lords in their instructions, September 12, 1568, where they say, that "in the writings produced in parliament, "there was no plain mention made, by the which her highness "might be convicted, albeit it were her own hand writ, *as it was* "*not;* and also the same was *culled by themselves in some principal* "*and substantious clauses.*"—Goodall, ii. 361. Laing, i. 208.

8. We have before seen, that a copy of the Scottish translation had been furtively communicated to the queen before the conferences. Hence she was better prepared to instruct her commissioners. Her words to them are, "In case they allege they have any writings of "mine, which may infer presumption against me in this case, you "shall desire the principals (originals) to be produced, and that I "myself have inspection thereof, and make answer thereto. For

"ye shall affirm in my name, I never writ any thing concerning "that matter to any creature; and, if any such writings be, they "are false and feigned, forged and invented by themselves, only to "my dishonour and slander; and there are divers in Scotland, both "men and women, that can counterfeit my hand-writing, and write "the like manner of writing which I use, as well as myself, and "principally such as are in company with themselves. And I doubt "not, if I had remained in my own realm, but I would have gotten "knowledge of the inventors and writers of such writing ere now, "to the declaration of my innocence, and confusion of their false-"hood."—Goodall, ii. 342. But Murray, though he had exhibited what he called the originals to Elizabeth's commissioners, never, even after this challenge from Mary, allowed them to be seen by the Scottish queen or by her agents.

NOTE L, p. 240.

During these conferences Morton received a letter from Frederick king of Denmark, directed to Lennox the Scottish regent. A Captain Clark, who had formerly received a commission to levy soldiers for the Dane in Scotland, had been persuaded to aid, with the troops under his orders, the associated lords, when they met Mary and Bothwell on Carberry Hill. Bothwell in Denmark remembered the injury, and revenged himself by some accusation which he brought against Clark, perhaps on this very ground, that he had employed Danish soldiers against the Scottish queen. Both Elizabeth and Lennox wrote earnestly to Frederick in favour of the accused, and demanded that Bothwell should be sent to England or Scotland, that he might be punished for the murder of Darnley.—See the letters in Laing, ii. 331. 1569, 1570. It was the answer of the king (January 20, 1571), sent by Thomas Buchanan, which fell into the hands of Morton. His anxiety to know the contents induced him to open it; and he kept it by him nearly a month before he forwarded it to the regent. His excuse for opening it was, that "he judged some things might be specified in it, which it might be "expedient to be remembered upon there" (in London): and for not sending it, his apprehensions that it might be intercepted, "for "that he had no will the contents of the same should be known, "fearing that some words and matters mentioned in the same, being "dispersed as news, should rather have injured than furthered the "cause." Elizabeth requested to see the letter; but he, pretending that he had sent the original away, gave her a copy, in which he omitted what he "thought not meet to be shown."—March 24, 1571. Goodall, ii. 382.

It is probable that in this letter there was some account of Bothwell's defence of himself, implicating Morton, and perhaps vindicating Mary; for it was calculated "to hinder, not further the

"cause." The letter was never seen afterwards; but it appears that the king refused to deliver up Bothwell, unless the English queen and the estates would bind themselves by solemn writings, which should be sent to Denmark against the 24th of August, that Bothwell should have a fair trial. Lennox (May 25th) asked the advice of Elizabeth on this subject. With her answer we are not acquainted.—Tytler, ii. 198—204.

I will here add, on the subject of Bothwell, a clause in the act of forfeiture against him, which was purposely omitted in the copy sent to Elizabeth. "In dicto mense Aprilis dilectos consiliarios "nostros Georgium comitem de Huntlie cancellarium nostrum, "Wilelmum Maitland de Lethingtoun Juniorem secretarium, secreti "consilii ac sessionis dominos, quum alloquium eorum amanter de- "sideraret, quum nihil minus suspicarent, captivos apprehendit, ac "in dicto castro de Dunbar incarceravit eos *ad spacium decem* "*dierum aut circa*, detinendo eos, assentire cogendo, saltem dicere "quod assentiebant, ad promovendum omnia sua proditoria et "nepharia facinora, precipue matrimonium pretensum inter eum et "dictam charissimam matrem nostram. Inde manifestissime crimen "lese majestatis incurrendo, authoritatemque regiam in se accep- "tando, dictis consiliariis nostris minime vocatis, aut pro ullo crimine "arrestatis, nullam ad hoc commissionem habendo."—Act Parl. iii. p. 8. Hence it appears that Huntley and Maitland were not dismissed the next morning, as is asserted by Melville, but remained at Dunbar, probably in concert with Bothwell.

Note M, p. 280.

Here in the first edition I introduced a note, which led to an interesting controversy, whether the massacre was an accidental occurrence, or the result of a premeditated plot. That controversy, as it appears to me, has been now set at rest by the publication (in the 3rd vol. of Mackintosh) of the secret despatches of Salviati, the nuncio at Paris, to the cardinal secretary at Rome for the information of the pontiff. On the 24th of August he wrote an account of the occurrence in ordinary characters (evidently under the notion that in such circumstances his despatch would probably be intercepted and opened on the road); but to this he added another and real statement of the case in cipher; that the queen regent, in consequence of the ascendancy which Coligny had acquired over the royal mind, an ascendancy which gave to him in a manner the government of the kingdom (quasi governava), consulted with the duchess of Nemours, and resolved to rid herself of his control by the assassination of the admiral. The duke of Guise provided the assassin; and the duke of Anjou, but not the king, was privy to the attempt. The queen, however, when she saw that the admiral did not die of his wound, and considered the great danger to which she

was now exposed, alarmed also by her own consciousness, and by the threatening speeches of the whole body of the Huguenots, who would not believe that the arquebuse had been discharged by an assassin employed by the duke of Alva, as she had persuaded herself that she could make them believe, had recourse to the king, and exhorted him to adopt the plan of the general massacre which followed. "Vedendo la regente che l' amiraglio non moriva, e "vedendo a quanto pericolo si era esposta, et della propria conscientia "insospetita, et dalle insolente parole che uscivano da tutta la "Ugonotteria, che in modo alcuno volle accommodarsi a credere, "che l' archibusata fosse stata tirata da insidiatore mandato dal "duca d' Alva, secondo che sempre lei si era persuasa de dover dare "loro a credere, si volse al Rè, esortandolo a la uccisione seguita di "tutti."

It appears that the cardinal secretary, in his answer to this despatch—probably on account of the different reports current in Rome—put to the nuncio several questions respecting the cause, the authors, and the circumstances of the massacre. Salviati, in reply, wrote two notes on the 22nd of September. In the first he says, "With regard to the three points, 1. Who it was that caused, and "for what reason that person caused, the arquebuse to be discharged "at the admiral; 2. and who it was to whom the subsequent re- "solution of so numerous a massacre must be ascribed; 3. and "who were the executors of the massacre, with the names of the "principal leaders; I know that I have already sent you an account, "and that in that account I have not fallen into the least error. If "I have omitted to mention some other particulars, the chief reason "is the difficulty of coming at the truth in this country."—"Chi "facesse tirar l' archibugiata all' Amiraglio, et per che causa, et a "chi si debba attribuire l' ultima risolutione dell' amazzamento di "tanti, e quali fussino gli executori con il nome di capi principali, "*io so d' haver gliene scritto et che non mi sono gabbato punto.* E "se ho lasciato di scrivere alcuni altri partiere, n' e stato potissima "causa la difficolta che e in questo paese a ritrovare la verità delle "cose."

This passage was written in ordinary characters; but he wrote the same day in cipher the following repetition of his former statement:—"Time will show whether there be any truth in all the "other accounts which you may have read, of the wounding and "the death of the admiral, that differ from what I wrote to you "The queen regent, being grown jealous of him, came to a resolu- "tion a few days before, and caused the arquebuse to be discharged "at him without the knowledge of the king, but with the participa- "tion of the duke of Anjou, and of the duchess of Nemours, and of "her son the duke of Guise. Had he died immediately, no one else "would have perished. But he did not die; and they began to "expect some great evil; wherefore, closeting themselves in con- "sultation with the king, they determined to throw shame aside, "and to cause him to be assassinated together with the others: a

"determination which was carried into execution that very night."
—"Tutte le cose che si saranno lette del archibusata e morte del "Amiraglio, diverse da quelle che io gli scrisse, col tempo si accor-"giera se siano vere. Mad. la Regente venuta in differenza (dif-"fidenza?) di lui, risolvendosi pochi giorni prima, gli la fece tirare, "e senza saputa del Rè, ma con participatione di M. di Angiu, di "Mad. de Nemours, et di M. di Guisa, suo figlo. E se moriva "subito, non si ammazzava altro : e non essendo morto, e dubitando "lei di qualche gran male, ristringendosi con il Rè, deliberono di "buttare la vergogna da banda, e di farlo ammazzare insieme con li "altri : e quella notte istessa fu mandato a esecutione."

Evidence more satisfactory than this we cannot desire, if we consider the situation of the writer, the object for which he wrote, and the time and opportunity which he possessed of correcting any error that might have crept into his previous communication ; and from this evidence it plainly follows, that the general massacre was not originally contemplated, but grew out of the unexpected failure of the attempt already made on the life of the admiral.

NOTE N, p. 337.

Sir Henry Ellis (2nd ser. iii. 86) has published Fletewoode's account to Lord Burghley of his searches for priests. The following account of such searches occurs in a contemporary manuscript :—"Then are "these searchers oft tyms soe rude and barbarouse that, yf the dores "be not opened in the instant when they would enter, they breake "open the dores with all violence as yf they were to sacke a town "of enemies wone by the swourd. Then it hath been usuall with "pursevants to rune up the staires and into the chambers with their "drowen swordes, enoughe to drive the weaker sort of woemen and "children owt of their witts. Then they begine to breake of locks "and open all the dores of the house presently, that they may at "one tyme search in many places. Then yf they find noe priest "nor suspected persons for priests in any of the chambers or closetts, "they goe presently to search for secrett places, and this they doe "most cuningly and strictly, soundinge the flowers and walls to "see yf they can finde any hollow places. They doe alsoe measure "the walls of the house and goe round about the house on the owt "side to see yf on part do answer to an other in hope to find some "voyd part left hollow wherein a man may be hidde. Sometyms "yf the walls be not made of stone, but of wainsecoate or other "weake matter, they will thrust thourow it with their swords in "many places, hopinge that in some place or other they light uppon "a priest, and this they doe alsoe in the roofes of the house uppon "supposition there may be some conveighance thoughe they can "not find the entrie into it. . . . . But the searchers yf they find "any likely cause of suspition, not contented with that dangerouse

"maner of triall with their swords, they then breake down the walls "wholly, and enter themselvs to searche with candells and torches in "all such darke places, and in house tops, where sometyms nothinge "but mise or birds have comne of many years. . . . . When the "searchers find not any priest for all this cruell diligence they have "used, they will not yet give over; but supposinge there is or may "be some so secretly hidden that yet he is there, for all that they "have done: then they appoint a watch about the house and everie "part thereof of 50 or 60 men and sometyms more, and these with "guns and bills, &c., and this they keepe for many dayes together "(intendinge to starve him owt) sometymes for 6 yea 10 and 12 "dayes continuance. Sometymes alsoe they place watche men in "the chambers of the house within bothe to keepe that noe catho-"licke shall stir to relieve the priest (thoughe commonly they make "them sure for that by lockinge them up all in one part of the "house together which they meane least to search as beinge least "suspected) and besides that they may harken yf any little stirringe "be behind a wall, yea to the breathing or coughing of a priest."—Gerard's MS. 23.

NOTE N, p. 338.

The following were the kinds of torture chiefly employed in the Tower:—

1. The rack was a large open frame of oak, raised three feet from the ground. The prisoner was laid under it, on his back, on the floor; his wrists and ankles were attached by cords to two rollers at the ends of the frame; these were moved by levers in opposite directions, till the body rose to a level with the frame. Questions were then put; and, if the answers did not prove satisfactory, the sufferer was stretched more and more till the bones started from their sockets.

2. The scavenger's daughter was a broad hoop of iron, so called, consisting of two parts, fastened to each other by a hinge. The prisoner was made to kneel on the pavement, and to contract himself into as small a compass as he could. Then the executioner, kneeling on his shoulders and having introduced the hoop under his legs, compressed the victim close together, till he was able to fasten the extremities over the small of the back. The time allotted to this kind of torture was an hour and a half, during which time it commonly happened that from excess of compression the blood started from the nostrils; sometimes, it was believed, from the extremities of the hands and feet.—See Bartoli, 250.

3. Iron gauntlets, which could be contracted by the aid of a screw. They served to compress the wrists and to suspend the prisoner in the air, from two distant points of a beam. He was placed on three pieces of wood, piled one on the other, which, when

his hands had been made fast, were successively withdrawn from under his feet. "I felt," says F. Gerard, one of the sufferers, "the "chief pain in my breast, belly, arms, and hands. I thought that "all the blood in my body had run into my arms, and began to "burst out at my finger ends. This was a mistake; but the arms "swelled, till the gauntlets were buried within the flesh. After "being thus suspended an hour, I fainted, and when I came to "myself, I found the executioners supporting me in their arms; "they replaced the pieces of wood under my feet; but as soon as I "was recovered, removed them again. Thus I continued hanging "for the space of five hours, during which I fainted eight or nine "times."—Apud Bartoli, 418.

4. A fourth kind of torture was a cell called "little ease." It was of so small dimensions, and so constructed, that the prisoner could neither stand, walk, sit, nor lie in it at full length. He was compelled to draw himself up in a squatting posture, and so remained during several days.

I will add a few lines from Rishton's Diary, that the reader may form some notion of the proceedings in the Tower.

Dec. 5, 1580. Several Catholics were brought from different prisons.

Dec. 10. Thomas Cottam and Luke Kirbye, priests (two of the number), suffered compression in the scavenger's daughter for more than a hour. Cottam bled profusely from the nose.

Dec. 15 Ralph Sherwine and Robert Johnson, priests, were severely tortured on the rack.

Dec. 16. Ralph Sherwine was tortured a second time on the rack.

Dec. 31. John Hart, after being chained five days to the floor, was led to the rack. Also Henry Orton, a lay gentleman.

1581, Jan 3. Christopher Thomson, an aged priest, was brought to the Tower, and racked the same day.

Jan. 14. Nicholas Roscaroc, a lay gentleman, was racked.

Thus he continues till June 21, 1585, when he was discharged. See his Diarium, at the end of his edition of Sanders.

NOTE O*, pp. 344 and 381.

Campian and Persons had obtained from Gregory XIII. a declaration that that part of the bull of Pius V. which forbade any person to pay obedience to Elizabeth, should not bind the English Catholics in existing circumstances, or till the sentence could be put in execution.—Camden, 348. Philopater, 169. From this it was inferred, with great appearance of reason, that both missionaries admitted the deposing power; and that, in an attempt to enforce the bull, they would join the enemies of the queen. It is, however, fair to hear what they and their friends said in their behalf; that they dis-

approved of the bull; and would have procured its revocation, if it had been possible; but, according to the custom of the court of Rome, no censure could be revoked, except at the petition of the party censured. They had therefore done all that it was in their power to do; they had procured a suspension of the bull for an indefinite period, which deprived it of all force, as long as the suspension should last, and could be of no detriment, if the suspension were ever removed, because in that case the question whether the bull obliged the English Catholics in conscience, would only be replaced on the same footing on which it stood before the suspension was obtained. They also trusted that they had thus performed a welcome service to the queen; for hitherto she professed to doubt the loyalty of her Catholic subjects, on account of the bull; now she could have no fear on that head, except in case of an actual attempt to enforce it; a case which in all probability would never arrive. The bull of Clement VII. against Henry VIII. had died away unnoticed, that of Pius against Elizabeth would do the same, if the English council would only permit it.—State Trials, 1057. Allen, Defence, c. iv. This declaration, which was not known till after the death of Campian, gave birth to the six queries put to the missionaries, respecting their opinions with regard to the deposing power, and their future behaviour in the event of an attempt to execute the bull. There is reason to suspect that the answers were not correctly given in the report published by authority; but there can be no doubt that most of them were evasive and unsatisfactory. The following is the account which Campian gave in court of his own answer to questions of the same import.

"The self-same articles" (as had been put to him by the queen) "were required of me by the commissioners, but I was much more "urged to the point of supremacy, and to further supposals, than I "could think of. I said, indeed, they were bloody questions, and "very pharisaical, undermining of my life: whereunto I answered "as Christ did to the dilemma; Give unto Cæsar that is due to "Cæsar, and to God that to God belongeth! I acknowledged her "highness as my governess and sovereign. I acknowledged her "majesty both *de facto et de jure* to be queen. I confessed an obe-"dience due to the crown, as to my temporal head and primate. "This I said then, this I say now. If, then, I failed in aught, I am "now ready to supply it. What would you more? I willingly "pay to her majesty what is hers; yet I must pay to God what is "his. Then, as for excommunicating her majesty, it was exacted "of me, admitting that excommunication were of effect, and that "the pope had sufficient authority so to do, whether then I thought "myself discharged of my allegiance or no? I said this was a "dangerous question, and they that demanded this demanded my "blood. But I never admitted any such matter; neither ought I "to be wrested with any such suppositions. What then, say they, "because I would not answer flatly to that I could not, forsooth I "sought corners; mine answers were aloof. Well; since once

"more it must needs be answered, I say generally, that these "matters be merely spiritual points of doctrine, and disputable in "the schools; no part of mine indictment, not to be given in evi- "dence, and unfit to be discussed at the King's Bench. To con- "clude, they are no matters of fact; they be not in the trial of the "country; the jury ought not to take notice of them; for although "I doubt not but they are very discreet men, and trained up in "great use and experience of controversies and debates, pertinent "to their callings, yet they are laymen, they are unfit judges to "decide so deep a question."—Howell, 1062.

I have inserted this answer at full length, for two reasons: 1. It contradicts the account published by government; that, when he was asked "whether he did, at that present, acknowledge her "majesty to be a true and lawful queen, or a pretended queen, and "deprived, and in possession of the crown only *de facto*, he "answered that question depended on the fact of Pius V., whereof "he was not judge, and therefore refused further to answer."—Howell, 1078. 2. It shows that the real question between the government and the prisoners was not that they denied the queen's right, and strove to withdraw her subjects from their allegiance (for they acknowledged her "to be their sovereign both *de facto* and *de "jure*, and that obedience was due to her as their temporal head and "primate"), but whether, in certain hypothetical cases, the pope possessed the power to depose princes. Three answered in the negative; two candidly confessed that, in their opinion, he had; the others are said to have refused to answer, or to have replied that the question was a matter of dispute among the learned, and that they were unable to pronounce, either one way or the other.

The innocence of the sufferers as to the treason for which they had been condemned, was believed by numbers. Their death was attributed to hatred of their religion; and, to relieve the government from the odium of persecution, Lord Burghley published a tract, entitled, "The execution of justice for maintenance of public "and Christian peace against the stirrers of sedition, &c." (It is printed in Somers's Tracts, i. 192.) He maintained that all were spared who were willing to renounce their treasons, and those only put to death who would not disavow the pope's bull, by which all the queen's subjects were discharged from their allegiance. Dr. Allen replied by "A true, sincere, and modest defence of Christian "Catholics, that suffered for their faith at home and abroad, &c." It was easy for him to show, that many had been put to death to whom no other treason had been objected but that of exercising the functions of the priesthood, and that thousands had been fined, imprisoned, and despoiled of all their property, for no other offence but the practice of religious worship. He maintained, that the companions of Campian had not been guilty of the treason for which they suffered, and that the answers they had given to the six queries ought to have been deemed satisfactory. He observed that

the deposing power and the validity of the bull of Pius V. were subjects never allowed to be debated in the seminaries, or by the missionaries in England; that it was unwise in the government to bring them into public discussion, but since it had been done, he was not unwilling to give his own opinion. The real question was this, could subjects lawfully rise against their prince in defence of their religion? That they could was plain: 1. From the authority of Calvin, Beza, Zwingle, Goodman, Knox, Luther, and the Magdeburgh divines, whose opinions he transcribed; 2. from the conduct of the reformers in Scotland, in France, and in the Netherlands; and 3. from the conduct of Elizabeth herself, who would never have aided with money and troops the Scottish, French, and Flemish insurgents, had she not been persuaded that rebellion was lawful in the cause of religion. This being established, he proceeds to inquire if it be more for the common good of society, that the decision of the fact, whether the grievance is such as to authorize resistance by force, should be left to the judgment of the people aggrieved, or of the pope, the common father of all. Of course he maintains the latter part of the alternative, and then endeavours to support it by the authority of two Catholic divines, of the Council of Lateran, and of examples from the Old Testament.—Allen, Defence, c. iv.

To suppress this tract, Aldfield, who had brought to England a number of copies, was prosecuted on a charge of high treason. In the indictment, several passages were transcribed (some of them very unfairly); wherever Allen spoke of kings in general, the innuendo charged him with meaning the queen in particular; and it was contended, that the object of the work was to raise rebellion in the realm, and to procure the dethronement of the sovereign. Aldfield suffered the death of a traitor.—See the indictment in Strype, iii. App. 121.

At the same time another Catholic clergyman of the name of Bishop, a zealous missionary, maintained the contrary doctrine. Assuming that the prisoners had suffered themselves to be deceived by the authority of the Council of Lateran, he undertook to show that the celebrated canon of that council was in reality a private decree of Innocent III., that it had never been acknowledged in England, and that no canons whatever had been published by the council itself.—Camden, 380. Shortly afterwards, another of the name of Wright maintained the same opinion.—Strype, iii. 251.

NOTE P, p. 366.

If we may believe Camden, in 1583, the discontent of the Catholics induced them to print books, in which they exhorted the queen's maids to treat her as Judith treated Holofernes.—Camden, 411. If this were true they could not have devised a plan more likely to defeat its own object.

The book to which he alludes, was "a Treatise of Schisme, by

"Gregorie Martin, Licentiate in Divinitie. Duaci, apud Joannem "Foulcrum, 1578." In the second chapter the author enumerates from the Old Testament, instances of persons who had refused to participate in any kind of worship which they deemed unlawful. The third instance is that of Tobias; for the fourth he proceeds thus:—"Judith followeth, whose godlye and constant wisedom, if "our Catholike gentlewomen would folowe, they might destroye "Holofernes, the master heretike, and amase all his retinew, and "never defile their religion by communicating with them in anye "smale poynt. She came to please Holofernes, but yet in her "religion she would not yeelde so muche as to eate of his meates, "but brought of her owne with her, and told him plainelye, that "being in his house, yet she must serve her Lorde and God stil, "desiring for that purpose libertie once a-day to goe in and out of "the gate. 'I may not eate of that which thou commandest me, "'lest I incurre God's displeasure.'"

In 1580, this book was reprinted by William Carter, who, in 1583, was indicted of treason, inasmuch as by the publication he had imagined the death of the queen and the subversion of the reformed church. At his trial the passage quoted above was that alleged against him. By Holofernes, the master heretic, was understood, so the crown lawyers contended, the queen, and by the destruction of Holofernes, was intended the queen's death. Carter replied, 1. By protesting before God, that he had never taken the passage in that sense, nor ever known it to be so taken by others. 2. By asserting what every impartial man must see, that it had a very different meaning. The whole object of the author was to warn his brethren against the sin of schism. For this purpose he advised the Catholic gentlewomen to imitate Judith; as she abstained from profane meats, so ought they to abstain from all communication with others in a worship which they believed to be schismatical. By doing this, they would destroy Holofernes. The expression was metaphorical. By Holofernes was meant Satan, the author of heresy, and the enemy of their salvation, whom they would overcome by their constancy in their religion, and their rejection of a schismatical service. But Carter's reasoning was not admitted, and he suffered as a traitor.—Bridgewater, 127—134. After an attentive perusal of the whole tract, I cannot find in it the smallest foundation for the charge.

NOTE Q, p. 386.

Mary Stuart and the Countess of Shrewsbury.

When, in the autumn of 1584, it was determined to take the Scottish queen from the custody of Lord Shrewsbury, reports were circulated that that nobleman had been too intimate with his royal

prisoner, and that more than one child had been the result of that intimacy. These reports were traced to the Countess of Shrewsbury and her sons by a former marriage, Charles and William Cavendish. The Scottish queen called for justice. She demanded that the presumed authors of such reports should be summoned before the council in the Star-chamber; that full liberty should be granted to them to prove the truth of these libels, if they could; and that condign punishment should be inflicted upon them, if they could not. From Elizabeth she received a promise of full satisfaction. Nothing, however, was done. In November Mary wrote several most urgent letters to the queen herself, to Walsingham, to the French ambassador, and even to the bishop of Glasgow, to solicit the intervention of the French monarch in support of this request. She then threatened that, if justice were denied to her, she would publish her own vindication, and prove the utter worthlessness of her chief accuser, by letting the world know how many calumnies that woman had uttered against her own sovereign in the presence of Mary herself. This threat appears to have effected her purpose. The countess and her sons were compelled to kneel before the queen in council, and to declare on their allegiance, and to confirm that declaration with their oaths, that they had no knowledge of the queen of Scots having borne any child during her residence in England, or of her having on any occasion acted contrary to the honour or chastity becoming a princess of her rank; that they never reported, or caused others to report, anything contrary to their present statements, and that they believed the reports circulated in England and other countries that the queen of Scots had borne one or more children to the earl of Shrewsbury, to be falsehoods, of which they were neither the authors nor propagators.—See Sadler to Walsingham, October 20, 1585; and Lettres de Marie, vii. 168, 299—305. Mary was satisfied, but the curiosity of Elizabeth was awakened. What were the tales which the countess had told of *her?* She sent a peremptory order to the Scottish queen to let her know. This is manifest from the very language of Mary's answer, which begins—Madame, suivant ce que je vous ay promis, *et avez despues desiré*, je vous declare, &c., and ends, De mon lit, forçant mon bras et mes douleurs *pour vous satisfayre et obeir*, Marie R.—Lettres de Marie, vi. 51, 57.

In this answer the libellous tales uttered by the countess respecting the character of her sovereign are recited, if we may believe the Scottish queen, as nearly as possible in the very words of the utterer herself. They begin with reports which must have proved most offensive to the feelings of the maiden queen; that Elizabeth had lived during several years with the earl of Leicester on the same intimate footing as if they had been man and wife; that when Leicester withdrew, Master Hatton was substituted in his place,—Hatton, for whom she often displayed the most childish fondness even in public, to his great annoyance and the infinite amusement of the spectators; that she was not content with her own country-

men; she was lavish of her honour to foreigners, such as Simier the agent of Anjou, and afterwards to Anjou himself. Other instances of incontinence follow; after which proofs are given of Elizabeth's vanity that exceed belief; of her voracious appetite for flattery, of the violence of her temper, and many other tales in one respect or other calculated to lower the character or to offend the prejudices of the English queen.

By several of the advocates of Mary Stuart this extraordinary letter has been pronounced a forgery. But that cannot be; it still exists among the Cecil Papers at Hatfield House, a holograph in the hand of the Scottish queen; from which original it was published by Murdin, p. 559, and again very recently by Prince Labanoff, Lettres de Marie, vi. 50. Others have attributed it to the malicious pleasure which she must have enjoyed in thus tormenting her tormentor. The fact, however, evidently is, that, as already has been proved, she wrote at the request and by order of Elizabeth herself. But did the English queen ever receive this letter? The probability is that she did not; for it cannot be supposed that Elizabeth would have allowed a document so offensive to her feelings, so defamatory of her character, to have passed into the hands of other persons, instead of destroying it, or of keeping it herself. Yet somehow or other this letter became the property of Lord Burghley, who left it behind him to his heirs. A probable solution of the question has been suggested by Prince Labanoff (ibid. p. 56), that Mary for some reason hesitated to send the letter to the queen, and deposited it in her cabinet, where it was found when her papers were seized at Chartley in 1586. Burghley might then have become possessed of it, and have appropriated it to himself.—Lettres de Marie, vi. 56.

It may perhaps be thought a confirmation of this conjecture, that of the letters of Mary to Elizabeth this is the only one without date of time or place; as if the Scottish queen, satisfied perhaps with the reparation made to her by the countess, had thought it advisable to lay by this letter among her other papers, where it would be ready to be forwarded with the proper date if Elizabeth should ever call for the same information again.

NOTE R, p. 423.

Ant^y Babingtons Lre to Pooley before his Apprehension.

"Robyn, Sollicitæ non possunt curæ mutare rati stamina fusi.
"I am ready to endure whatsoev^r shall be inflicted. Et facere, et
"pati Romanum est. What my course hath been towards Mr.
"Secretary, you can wyttnes, what my love towards yo^u yo^r self can
"best tell. Proceedings at my lodgings have been very strange.
"I am the same I allwayes pretended. I pray God yo^w be, and

"ever so remayne towards me. Take hede to yo^r own p^te least of "these my mysfortunes yo^u beare the blame. Est exilium, inter "malos vivere. Farewell, swete Robyn, if, as I take the true to me. "If not, Adieu, omnium bipedum iniquissimus. Retorne me thyne "answere for my satisfaction and my dyamond and what else thou "wilt. The furnace is prepared, wherein our faythe must be tryed. "Farewell till we mete, w^ch God knowes when.

"Thyne, ho^w farr tho^u knowest,

"ANTHONY BABINGTON."

NOTE S, p. 433.

I do not think that the charge against the Scottish queen carries with it any great appearance of improbability. It is very possible that a woman who had suffered an unjust imprisonment of twenty years, and was daily harassed with the fear of assassination, might conceive it lawful to preserve her own life and recover her liberty by the death of her oppressor. "Car," says Chasteauneuf, in a letter of August 26, "estant nee princesse souveraine, et detenue prison-"niere par si long temps contre raison, elle ne peult estre blasmée "(quand bien elle auroit faict tout ce dont on la veult charger), si "elle a cherché tous les moyens de se delivrer."—Egerton, 232. But the real question is, not what she might have thought, but whether she actually gave her consent and approbation to the scheme of murder submitted to her in the name of Babington.

1. Mary, as we have already seen, denied that "the poynts of "the letters that concerned the practise against the Quene were by "her written, or of her knolledg" (page 440). She also affirmed upon oath that she had never been party to any design against the life of Elizabeth; and the same affirmation she repeated in the course of her prayer on the scaffold.

To bring the charge home to her after her denial, it was necessary to show that the copy of her answers to Babington produced in court, was a faithful representation of the real answer which she had commissioned Curle to put into cipher, and forward to the conspirator. Now, without disputing the fidelity of Curle, we know that that answer passed from Curle into the hands of Philipps at Chartley, and that it remained in the possession of Philipps and Walsingham, men actually engaged in a plot to bring Mary to the scaffold, not fewer than ten days,—from the 18th to the 28th of July,—before it was sent by them to Babington. Did it come out of their hands in the same state in which it came into them? Did they forward to him the original, as it was ciphered by Curle, or a transcript made by Philipps? Then what became of it afterwards? Of that we are also ignorant. At Fotheringhay Mary asked to look at the original, to see whether it was written in her cipher. It was not produced; but in its place was substituted a deciphered copy,

But if they had not the original, where did they procure the copy? By whom was it made? On this head again they were silent. To have given any explanation would have betrayed their secret, would have discovered, in the slang language of Philipps, "by what way "the wind came in."

2. If the reader turn back to p. 419, he will see that the Scottish queen wrote with her own hand a minute of the answer to be returned to Babington, and that Nau formed that minute into a letter in the French language, which was translated into English by Curle, and was then forwarded to Babington. What had become of that minute and of that French letter? Both Nau and Curle had been brought prisoners to Walsingham's house, where his agents were in constant communication with them, urging them to save their lives by spontaneous confessions. In the first of these confessions, dated on September 3, Nau appealed to the Scottish queen's minute, and to his own letter, adding that the lords of the council had both in their possession. "Ainsi qu'il apparoit à vos Hon. ayant *l'une* et "*l'autre* entre vos mains."—Nau, Conf. Sept. 3. It is plain that, if this be true, the comparison of these two documents with the deciphered copy of the letter *received* by Babington would prove, either that Mary was accessary to the intended assassination of Elizabeth, or that Walsingham and his secretaries had been guilty of a most atrocious forgery by introducing such approval into her answer. Had this fraud been committed or not? If it had, as Mary's advocates contend, there would have remained to Walsingham but one course in order to escape detection, and that was to destroy or to suppress the two documents which Nau had so confidently called for.

The manœuvres which now took place on the part of Walsingham and Philipps were so very extraordinary, that it will be worth the reader's while to follow them step by step, till we come to their conclusion at Fotheringhay. It was on the 3rd of September that Nau asserted the existence of the two documents. On the 4th Philipps wrote a long letter to Lord Burghley to show that no additional evidence was necessary; they had already abundant proof from the intercepted letters of the Scottish queen, that both Nau and Curle had been guilty of high treason, because they had written at her dictation passages in those letters, calculated to stir up rebellion within the realm, and to provoke invasion from the enemy without. These proofs he specified in detail, but the lord treasurer required something more; and Philipps on the same day wrote to him a second and more important letter. In the first he had confined himself to the guilt of the two secretaries; in this he undertakes to connect Mary Stuart not only with the treasons mentioned before, but also with the murder of the queen's person. He reasons thus: "The minutes of the letters already mentioned are in their "own hands, as themselves confess; *the like trust not unlike to be* "*given for writing those to Babington.*" But this is a mere conjecture, which shows plainly that hitherto they possessed no positive

proof that Mary had authorized the contents of the letter received, as coming from her by Babington.—See the two letters of Philipps in a very instructive note at the end of Mr. Tytler's vol. viii. No. xiv.

In the same letter Philipps alleges, that "the heads of that bloody "letter sent to Babington, touching the designment (murder) of the "queen's person, is of Nau's hand likewise." But here there is much deception. They had discovered a minute written by Nau, containing apparently the heads of a letter which they maintained to be the letter of Babington, though in reality it had no relation to that letter. It ran in these terms: Secours de dehors—Forces dans le pays— Armée d'Espagne au retour des Indes—Armée de France au mesme temps, si la paix se faict—Guise, s'il ne passe tiendra la France occupée—De Flandres de mesme—Ecosse au mesme temps—Coup—Sortie. This minute seems to be a collection of subjects which the queen meant to discuss in a letter, or of points which she had selected for subsequent consideration. There is hardly one of them on which she does not give an opinion in one or other of her letters written at this time; and yet there is not a single letter in which the greater part of them is even mentioned. For that reason they cannot be the minute of the letter to Babington. Yet it was so contended by Walsingham and Philipps, and in addition that the word *coup* meant the murder of Elizabeth, though it might easily mean the simultaneous rising of Mary's friends, or the sudden attack upon Chartley. However, the interpretation put upon the minute by them was certainly admitted by Lord Burghley, who on the same evening wrote to Hatton that a promise of mercy ought to be made to Nau and Curles that they might "yeld in ther wrytyng sōewhat to confirm ther mastriss "crymes; if they war pswaded that themselves might scape, and "the blow (coup) fall upon ther M^rs. betwyxt hir head, and hir "shulders, surely we shuld have y^e whole frō hyr."—From Mr. Leigh's Papers. This allusion to the coup shows that he was acquainted with the minute, and at the same time aware that it could prove nothing against Mary Stuart, because, whatever might be its true meaning, it was not in her handwriting. Still it retained the designation which had been given to it, and was exhibited at Fotheringhay among the other supposed proofs of the Scottish queen's guilt.

The same evening Walsingham wrote from his own house to Philipps, who was at Windsor, that the minute of the Scottish queen's answer "was not extant;" that Nau would confess nothing which could not be proved against him; and that his chief hope was in Curle, who, if still kept under his eye, might be induced through hope of favour to afford some useful testimony.—See his letter in Tytler's note xiv. at the end of vol. viii.

Nau by his appeal had disconcerted the astucious secretary. Walsingham might get rid of Mary's minute by denying its existence, and "wishing to God that it might be found;" but he could not deny the existence of Nau's letter drawn from that minute;

because it was only through Nau's letter that he could make her responsible for the murderous passages existing in her answer to Babington. Of course then he will now bring forward Nau's letter. No: that does not suit his purpose. How then will he supply the chasm in the evidence which the absence of that letter must produce? By bringing forward what he will call a copy of that letter, agreeing in every particular with the answer received by Babington, and by claiming for such copy as much authority as if it were the original itself.

A copy so prepared was on September 5 laid before Babington in the Tower, who accordingly wrote under it—"Cest la copie des lettres "de la Royne d'Escosse dernierement a moy envoyees. Anthonie "Babington." The same copy was next laid before Curle, who subscribed in these words: "Telle ou semblable me semble avoir esté la "reponse escripte en francoys par monsieur Nau, laquelle j'ay traduict "et mis en chiffre.—Gilbert Curle, 5 Sept., 1586." This subscription of Curle evidently regards the letter by Nau, but it is accompanied with a qualification, significative of distrust in the accuracy of the copy, as far as he dared to signify such distrust: "Telle, ou sem- "blable me semble."

Sept. 6. After this testimony of Curle, Nau could not refuse to subscribe. He wrote: "Je pense de vray que c'est la lettre "escripte par sa Majesté à Babington, comme il me souvient. Nau, "6 Sept. 1586." Yet even now, it will be observed, he speaks with some hesitation. It is the copy, "as well as he can remem- "ber,"—Comme il me souvient, or, comme il m'en peult souvenir, as it is entered on the record. But why, we may suppose him to have said, do you require me to speak from memory? You have the original of my letter, as well as the minute of the queen. Why do you not produce them? That he argued in such manner, appears from this, that the next day (September 7) Philipps received from Wade the following peremptory order on the part of Elizabeth:— "It is her majesty's pleasure, you should presently repair hither, for "that, upon Nau's confession it should appear that *we* have not "performed the search sufficiently. He doth assure we shall find "among the minutes, which were in Pasquier's chests, the copies of "the letters wanting both in French and English.—Tytler, viii. note xiv. From this it appears that the papers seized at Chartley had been taken to Windsor, and that Wade and Philipps had been already employed to search among them for the two documents to which Nau had so boldly appealed. That the search was renewed, we cannot doubt, but, as they were never produced, we may take it for granted that the minute at least was not found.

Sept. 10. Nau presented a long memorial to the queen, in which he protested that the first information which Mary Stuart received of the conspiracy against the life of Elizabeth was from Babington's letter; that she determined to return no answer to that point; but, believing that, if it should be attempted, her own life would be taken in revenge, she resolved to accept the offer made by

Babington to procure her escape from Chartley, and that the whole of her answer, which he acknowledged that he wrote from her dictation, was confined to the sole object of regaining her liberty. The only persons from whom she had heard of the conspiracy were Babington and Gilbert Gifford; but it was an enterprise with which she would have no concern.—Lettres de Marie, vii. 207—209. This memorial, so exculpatory of Mary, disappointed Burghley, who indorsed it thus: "Nau's long declaration of things of no "importance."

Sept. 20. On this day Babington was executed, and before his execution, was prevailed upon to acknowledge as true by his subscription, the copies of his letter to Mary Stuart and of her answer to him, and to point out the alphabet of ciphers in which both were written. It was probably thought that his subscription at that moment would give additional credit to these copies. It was the attestation of a person at the point of death. In reality it proved merely that the copy of Mary's answer was a correct copy of the answer which he received, and that the copy of Nau's letter perfectly agreed with it; but it could not prove that the one was a correct copy of Mary's answer before it had been copied in Walsingham's office, or of Nau's letter before it had gone through the same process. Of all that Babington had no knowledge.

The reader is aware of the revolting cruelty with which he and his companions were treated at the gallows, and the next day (September 21) the Scottish queen's secretaries, trembling lest they should meet with a similar fate, were called before the chancellor, Burghley, and Hatton, commissioners appointed to interrogate them preparatory to their trial. On the 23rd, these interrogations were resumed. They were compelled to depose upon oath that their former subscriptions were true. Certain passages from the alleged answer of Mary to Babington were laid before them in English, to be translated by them into French for the sake of comparison, and each was called upon to write down such points as he could *remember* to have been written in her answer. All this is entered in the record of the trial, in a very confused manner; but not a word appears to have been extracted from them, to show that Mary had made any allusion to the murder of Elizabeth.

Here, however, it must be remarked that there was much of deception in the manner in which the attestations and subscriptions were exhibited. By an ingenious contrivance, men not admitted into the secret were led to believe that the instrument to which the subscriptions were attached was a copy of the letter actually received by Babington. Burghley himself seems to have understood it so. In a letter to Walsingham of the 8th of September, he says of Nau's subscription on the 6th, "Nau hath amply con-"fessed by his handwryting to have wrytten by the Queen's en-"dyting and her own minute y^e^ long ltre to Babington." The same was the persuasion entertained at the trial at Fotheringhay, and the same has been generally repeated by writers since that period. It

was indeed indorsed by Philipps, "Queen of Scots to Anthony "Babington, 17th July, 1586," and subscribed by Babington: "C'est la copie des lettres de la Royne d'Escosse dernièrement à moy "envoyées. Anthonie Babington." But how could that be so? The letter which Babington had received was written in the English language; this to which he subscribes is written in the French language. Why does he subscribe in French and not in English? Such questions might perhaps have been asked at Fotheringhay, but we learn from the record, that all the subscriptions to the copy produced there were written in English, and that Babington's had been translated for him thus:—"This is the very trewe copie of y^e^ "Queenes letter last sent unto me, Ant^y^ Bab^n^." The fact, however, is, the instrument laid before them was not openly propounded as a copy of the letter actually received by Babington, but as a copy of the French letter composed by Nau from the minute and the dictation of Mary Stuart; the very letter in fact which Nau maintained that they possessed, and to which he appealed in defence of his own innocence, and that of the Scottish queen, as far as concerned the project of assassination. This is evident from its being in the French language; from the testimony of Curle—"La response "faicte à cette lettre (of Babington) estant *escript premierement en* "*Francoys* par Mr. Nau," September 5, and again in his examination of September 21: "The queen directed Nau to draw the "answer to the same lre, y^e^ which Nau drew in French, and y^t^ "doone y^e^ Sco. Q. willed this examinate to put it into English." (From the Record.).

Taking, therefore, this for granted, that the letter in French, to which the subscriptions were attached, was brought forward as a copy of Nau's letter, it may be asked what could have induced Walsingham to adopt this circuitous and deceptive method of stamping authority on a disputed copy, when he might at any moment have obtained his full purpose by the simple exhibition of the original? It seems to me that there is but one solution of the question. The original did not contain any allusion to the projected murder of Elizabeth; but the letter which he had forwarded to Babington was known to contain several such allusions. It therefore became necessary to suppress the original, and to exhibit a pretended copy, into which he might introduce all the murderous passages contained in the letter received by Babington.

3. The reader is aware (see p. 421) that Camden, having stated that a postscript, inquiring the names of the six gentlemen appointed to assassinate the queen, had been appended to Mary's letter in Walsingham's office, adds his suspicion that some passages in the letter itself might also be fabricated at the same time,—Si non et quædam alia. Of this there never appeared to me any reason to doubt. The man capable of forging the postscript was capable of introducing any falsifications which suited his purpose. Prince Labanoff is so convinced of the same, that in his edition of Nau's letter, he has distinguished what he considers as the interpolated

passages from the rest of the text by printing them in Italics. Score out those passages, and the letter will be restored to that state in which, according to Mary and Nau, it was originally written, that is, it will be confined to the insurrection in England, and to her escape from prison. Thus it reads more naturally, and is free from the objections which otherwise force themselves on the mind of every attentive and cautious inquirer.

Philipps, indeed, was a most accomplished artist in his way; yet it is possible that in a very long letter he might not have been so constantly on his guard, as to make all his interpolations perfectly harmonize with other and more distant parts of the same letter. Thus in the following instance the hand of the interpolator seems to me to betray itself. "The affaires," Mary is made to say, "being thus "prepared, and forces in readines without and within the realm, "then shall it be time *to sett the sixe gentilmen to work* (to assas- "sinate the queen), takinge order upon the accomplishinge of *their* "*dessiegne* (the assassination), I may be sodaynlye transported out "of this place, and that all your forces at the same time be on the "felde to meet me, in tarryinge for the arrival of the forayne aide, "which then must be hastened with all diligence." She then directs four stout horsemen to be kept at court to advertise her of the accomplishment of the design (assassination), that she may escape before her keepers have time to fortify the house. This she adds is the best plot that she can devise; "for sturringe on this side "before you be assured of sufficient forraine forces, it weare but for "nothinge to put yourselves in danger . . . . . and to take me "forth of this place, unbeing before well assured to sett me in the "midst of a good armie, or in some very good strengthe . . . . . "it weare sufficient excuse given to that queene, in catching me "againe, to enclose me in some hold out of which I should never "escape, if she did use me no worse." But how could Elizabeth catch her again if Elizabeth were already put to death? It was natural enough that Mary should fear a second and more rigorous imprisonment if she were again to fall into the hands of the queen; and should therefore forbid any attempt to liberate her without a sufficient force for her protection; but that she should entertain any fear of falling into the hands of Elizabeth, when she had directed that the attempt to liberate her should depend on the accomplishment of the design of the six gentlemen (that is, on the previous murder of Elizabeth), it is impossible to conceive. The reason which she assigns for her previous direction is to me a proof that no mention of assassination had been contained in the original letter.

Walsingham appears to have been aware of this contradiction before the trial at Fotheringhay; for Serjeant Puckering received instructions in his brief to contend that in this passage Mary meant to forbid any attempt for her deliverance, "before *eyther* they had "a stronge armie in readyness to place her in, or they had dispatched "her ma^tie, and then (said she) if that queene take me agayne I

"shall be for ever inclosed in a hole, if she use me no worse."—Mr. Leigh's Papers. In the text itself, I see not this alternative. The murder of the queen is there required to precede the liberation of the captive.

4. At Fotheringhay Mary had called for her two secretaries to be confronted with her: this was refused. At Westminster they were brought forward: but then she was absent at Fotheringhay. Little reliance can be placed on confessions drawn from prisoners through the fear of the rack and the scaffold; we have, however, the benefit of the testimony both of Nau and Curle, on other less trying occasions. At Westminster Nau openly declared before the commissioners that the chief points of the charge, those on which alone any pretext for condemnation could be based, were false, calumnious and fabricated. "He did then deny and maintain de faulx les 'principaux chefs de l'accusation mise en avaunt contre sa matie, "et pour lesquels seuls on pouvoit prendre couleur ou pretexte de "la condamner . . . . . accusation faulse, calomnieuse et sup-"posée." He wrote this, indeed, as late as March 5, 1605; but appealed for the truth of it to the recollection of the noblemen and gentlemen who had been present on the occasion, and were still alive;—adding that, if this his last and public declaration had been contrary to his former declarations in private before the commissioners, "led. sr. de Walsingham n'eust point failly à me le reviler "sur la face, pour me convaincre de mensonge, et moy mesmes je "n'eusse jamais en l'assurance devant ceulx mesmes qui m'avoient "interrogé, de me desmentir et tenir un langage toute contraire." It was a misfortune that he spoke in French, which it appears was less generally understood than Italian; for one of the lords desired him to speak in that language.—Harl. MS. 46, 49, 82.

The other statement on the part of Curle, is the last confession which he subscribed on the 6th of August, 1587, preparatory to his discharge from Walsingham's house, after a year's confinement; and of which we may presume that it contains as much as could be extorted from him in favour of the prosecution. In it he says: "Moreover were shewed me the two very letters writin by me in "cipher, and receive(d by) Babington, and the trew desciffrements "of both word by word with the two alphabet between her ma^{ty} "and him, the counter alphabets whereof were found amongst her "papers. The copy of the first of the said letters writtin with my "own hand which I could not avoid to acknowledge as I did, and a "trew copy of Babington's principal letters to her ma^{ty}, the whole "acknowledged by his confession under his own hand; also after-"wards the postscript of the said letters of Babington to Mr. Nau "to ask his opinion of one Mr. Powley, the said postscriptum "acknowledged by Mr. Nau, and that I had answered the same in "her name, which answer, containing only in effect, that Babington "should not trust Powles, was found writtin with my hand among "the rest of the papers, and sundry letters to and fro between the "conveyers of the pacquets, and one whereby appeared the receipt

"of the Babington letters, and the conveyance of the answer "thereof."—It may here be observed, that in this long enumeration, the only letters to Babington which he admits as having been exhibited to him are the notes of the 15th of June, and the 12th of July, not the important answer of the 17th. He then proceeds:— "Upon which so manifest and unrecusable evidence I could not "deny in any sorte; but it behoved me at length for most impor- "tant respects to confesse, as I did, that I had disciphered Babing- "tone his principal letters to her ma^ty, and that I received from Mr. "Nau by her commandment her answer thereunto, after she had "read and perused the same in my presence, which answer I trans- "lated into English, and after the perusing thereof by her ma^ty put "it in cifre, ere it was sent to Babington. In witnesse whereof I "have subscribed these presents with my hand at London the vi of "August, 1587.

"CURLL." (with a paraphe.)

A cursory perusal of this instrument might lead the reader to take it for an admission by Curle of the matter in dispute; but a closer inspection will convince him that it has no reference to the subject. Curle acknowledges, indeed, that Mary answered the letter of Babington, and that he translated and put her answer into cipher; but whether that answer was or was not fairly represented by the deciphered copy produced at Fotheringhay, is a question into which he does not enter, and into which, probably, he could not enter, for the fair inference from this and his former confessions is, that he was never allowed to see that deciphered copy.[1]

Before I conclude this note, I must acknowledge my obligations for much of the new matter contained in it to the invaluable collection of Queen Mary's letters by Prince A. Labanoff. vols. vi. vii., and to the discovery of several original letters among the papers in the State Paper Office by Mr. Tytler. See his vol. viii. passim.

NOTE T, p. 444.

The following is a serious instance of the queen's positiveness, and utter contempt of the maxims and forms ordinarily observed in courts of justice. The earl of Shrewsbury had been excused from attending at Fotheringhay on account of indisposition. Still, though he was personally ignorant of the proceedings, she resolved that he should lend the sanction of his name to the judgment. With this view Lord Burghley visited him at Stilton, and gave him

[1] A copy of this confession of Curle, but strangely metamorphosed, and dated the 7th of August, is in Mr. Von. Raumer's vol. iii. p. 327. The above was copied for me by Mr. Holmes, from the original (Cot. MS. Cal. I.) compared with the Harl. MS. 4647, which has supplied a few words in places where the original had been damaged by fire.

an account of the trial. On October 22 the lord chancellor wrote to the earl by order of the queen, "to come to Westminster, if "possibly he could, for the finishing of the commission on the "25th." This letter was accompanied by another from Burghley, informing him of the queen's great desire that he should concur with the other commissioners in the judgment. If he could not come, "then," says he, "I pray y^r. lordship to write to me that "when, upon conference with me, we both thought that the Scottish "queen had not cleared herself by her answers" (how guardedly this is expressed!) "for the matter wherewith she was charged, for "compassing and imagining the Q. Ma^ties. death, that your lordship "would, if you were present, deliver y^r. sentence soe to be, and "therefore in y^r. absence, coming by infirmities, you both require "and authorize me to deliver y^r. opinion soe to be."

On the 26th Burghley writes again: "Yesterday in the Starr-"chamber, when all the commissioners, among which number there "wanted only y^r. lordship and my lord of Warwick, both upon "cause, were assembled, and had pronounced their sentence, all in "one manner, to charge the queene of Scots with privity of the con-"spiracy, and with the compassing and imagining also of divers "things tending to the hurt and destruction of her ma^ties. person, "my lord chancellour and I did declare, by reading of y^r. lordship's "letter, y^r. sentence conform to the general sentence of all the rest; "and there it was ordered that on Monday next (the 31st) the pro-"cess with the sentence should be put in writing in the form of a "record, to the which it is meant that we shall all put our seals."

On the following day, the 27th, he writes a third time. He had learned from the judges that the former letter of the earl did not give to Burghley a legal right to act for him. He therefore says: "I do "now send y^r. lordship the true copy of y^r. former letter with an "interlineation of some things to be altered in form: and I have "also sent to y^r. lordship in a paper apart such words as are to be "inserted in a new letter in place of those that are underlined; "and so I remit to y lordship's consideration to cause y^r. letter to "be writ to my lord chancellor and to me as y^r. former was, and of "the same date, with the changing only of so much as I have under-"lined, and in place thereof to write the other sentences contained "in the other paper here enclosed."

On the 28th the earl wrote an answer, published by Lodge, ii. 333, giving to them authority to subscribe his name, and sending his seal "for the ensealing thereof."

After all, this vicarious subscription was thought insufficient; for on November 30, Lord Burghley writes: "The sentence was sub-"scribed yesterday by all the commissioners that were here at par-"liament, and I have answered for y^r. lordship that you will not "fail to sign at any time, and so left a space for your name."

From papers in possession of the earl of Shrewsbury.

NOTE U, p. 505—*Vide* NOTE N.

NOTE X, p. 508.

In the present note I purpose to give some account of this tract, which every writer on the armada is careful to mention, though few of them ever had it in their hands. It was printed at Antwerp, to be distributed in England at the moment of the invasion; but the invasion did not take place, and care was taken to burn almost all the copies. Hence the book is become extremely scarce. The title is, an "Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and "Ireland, concerninge the present warres made for the execution of "his holines sentence, by the highe and mightie kinge Catholicke "of Spaine, by the cardinal of Englande. Anno MDLXXXVIII." It begins thus: "Gulielmus miseratione divina S. R. E. tituli "Sancti Martini in Montibus Cardinalis Presbyter, de Anglia nun- "cupatus, cunctis regnorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ proceribus, populis, "et personis, omnibusque Christi fidelibus salutem in Domino sem- "piternam." After a short preface, it undertakes to show, 1. Of whom and in what manner Elizabeth is descended; 2. How intruded into the royal dignity; 3. How she has behaved at home and abroad; 4. By what laws of God and man her punishment is pursued; 5. How just, honest, and necessary causes all true Englishmen have to embrace and set forward the same.

"1. She is a bastard, the daughter of Henry VIII., by his inces- "tuous commerce with Anne Boleyn.

"2. She was intruded by force, unjustly deposing the lords of "the clergy, without whom no lawful parliament could be held, nor "statute made; and without any approbation of the see of Rome, "contrary to the accord made by King John, at the special request "and procurement of the lords and commons, as a thing necessary "to preserve the realm from the unjust usurpation of tyrants.

"3. As to her behaviour, she has professed herself a heretic. "She usurpeth, by Luciferian pride, the title of supreme ecclesias- "tical government, a thing in a woman unheard of, not tolerable to "the masters of her own sect, and to all Catholics in the world "most ridiculous, absurd, monstrous, detestable, and a very fable to "the posterity.

"She is taken and known for an incestuous bastard, begotten "and born in sin, of an infamous courtezan, Anne Boleyn, after- "wards executed for advoutery, treason, heresy, and incest, among "others with her own natural brother, which Anne Boleyn her "father kept by pretensed marriage in the life of his lawful wife, as "he did before unnaturally know and kepe both the said Anne's "mother and sister.

"She is guilty of perjury in violating her coronation oath.

"She hath abolished the Catholic religion—profaned the sacra- "ments—forbidden preaching—impiously spoiled the churches,

"deposed and imprisoned the bishops, and suppressed the monas-
"teries.

"She hath destroyed most of the ancient nobility, putting into
"their houses and chambers traitors, spials, delators, and pro-
"moters, that take watch for her of all their ways, words, and
"writings.

"She hath raised a new nobility of men base and impure, inflamed
"with infinite avarice and ambition.

"She hath intruded a new clergy of the very refuse of the worst
"sort of mortal men.

"She hath made the country a place of refuge for atheists, ana-
"baptists, heretics, and rebels of all nations.

"She hath polled the people, not only by more frequent and
"large subsidies than any other princes, but by sundry shameful
"guiles of lotteries, laws, decrets, falls of money, and such like
"deceits.

"She sells laws, licences, dispensations, pardons, &c., for money
"and bribes, with which she enriches her poor cousins and favour-
"ites. Among the latter is Leicester, when she took up first to
"serve her filthy lust; whereof to have more freedom and interest,
"he caused his own wife to be murdered, as afterwarde, for the
"accomplishment of his like brutish pleasures with another noble
"dame, it is openly known he made away with her husband. This
"man over-ruleth the chamber, court, council, parliament, ports,
"forts, seas, ships, tenders, men, munition, and all the country.

"With the aforesaid person, and with divers others, she hath
"abused her bodie against God's lawes, to the disgrace of princely
"majestie, and the whole nation's reproache, by unspeakable and
"incredible variety of luste, which modesty suffereth not to be re-
"membered, neyther were it to chaste eares to be uttered how
"shamfully she hath defiled and infamed her person and cuntry,
"and made her court as a trappe, by this damnable and detestable
"art to intangle in sinne, and overthrowe the yonger sorte of the
"nobilitye and gentlemen of the lande; wherebye she is become
"notorious to the worlde, and in other cuntryes a common fable for
"this her turpitude, which in so highe degre, namely in a woman
"and a queene, deservethe not onlie deposition, but all vengeance,
"both of God and man, and cannot be tolerated without eternal
"infamie of our whole countrie, the whole worlde deriding our
"effeminate dastardie, that have suffered such a creature almost
"thirty years together to raigne both over our bodies and soules,
"and to have the chief regiment of al our affaires, as wel spirituall
"as temporal, to the extinguishinge not onely of religion, but of all
"chaste livinge and honesty.

"She does not marry, because she cannot confine herself to one
"man; and to the condemnation of chaste and lawful marriage she
"forced the very parliament to give consent to a law, that none
"should be named for her successor, savinge the natural, that is to
"saie, bastard-borne child of her owne bodie." (Here is an allusion
"to her unlawfule, longe concealed, or *fained* issue.")

"She confederates with rebels of all nations, and is known to be "the first and principal fountain of all those furious rebellions in "Scotland, France, and Flandres; sending abroad by her ministers, "as is proved by intercepted letters and confessions, numbers of "intelligencers, spies, and practisers, in most princes' courts, not "only to give notice of news, but to deal with the discontented, and "hath sought to destroy the persons of the pope's holiness and the "king of Spain.

"She is excessively proud, obstinate, and impenitent, though she "has been excommunicated eighteen years.

"She hath murdered bishops, and priests, and the queen of "Scots."

4. Having noticed several instances of the depositions of kings in the Old Testament, and the excommunication of emperors by different popes, it observes "that the sentence given by Pius V. "hath not been pursued, partly on account of his death, and partly "on account of her great power. But her perseverance in sin, her "persecution of the Catholics, and her aiding of rebels, have induced "Sixtus V. to intreat Philip of Spain, to take upon him this sacred "and glorious enterprise, to which he hath consented, moved by his "own zeal, by the authority of his holiness, and by the cardinal's "humble and continual sute for the delivery of his countrymen."

The fifth part I need not analyze. Its contents are more generally known, and may be found in Fuller, l. ix. p. 196, and in Mr. Butler's Memoirs, iii. 213. At the end is given the date: "From "my lodginge in the palace of St. Peter in Rome, this 28th of "Aprill, 1588. The Cardinall."[1]

The author of this most offensive publication seems to have studied the works, and to have acquired the style, of the exiles who, formerly, at Geneva, published libels against Queen Mary, the predecessor of Elizabeth. Who that author was, soon became a subject of discussion. The language and the manner are certainly not like those of Allen in his acknowledged works; and the appellant priests boldly asserted that the book was "penned altogether by "the advice of F. Persons." Persons himself, in his answer, though he twice notices the charge, seems by his evasions to acknowledge its truth.—Manifestation, 35, 47. But whoever were the real author, the cardinal, by subscribing his name, adopted the tract for his own, and thus became answerable for its contents.

It is, however, but justice to add, that we have in Strype (iv. 144) a letter from him, preserved by Cecil, in a very different style. It arose out of a communication from Hopkins, an English agent, that the queen was desirous of peace, and not unwilling to grant some sort of toleration. The cardinal expresses his joy at the news;

[1] The substance of "the Admonition" was compressed into a smaller compass, under the title of "A declaration of the sentence and deposition of Elizabeth, the "usurper and pretended Queene of England," and was printed separately for distribution on a broadside in 81 lines. But the copies of this were also destroyed on the failure of the armada; one copy, perhaps the only one now in existence, was lately in the possession of Mr. H. G. Bohn, York-street, Covent-garden.

it is what he has been known to wish for of old; and what he will endeavour to promote to the best of his power. If the queen will only consent to grant toleration, and to restore the Spanish places now in her possession, he will answer that no demand shall be made for reparation of other injuries, &c., and that peace may thus be restored to the Christian world, "whereof," he adds, "if I might by "any office of my life or death be a promoter or procurer, I would "reckon the remanent of my few years yet to come, more fortunate "than the many evil and long years of my life past," &c.—Ibid. 146. Part of it is in the Biographia Britannica, art. Allen.

NOTE Y, p. 525.

I shall here add a few particulars respecting this noble person.—His speech to the lieutenant of the Tower, who visited him a few days before his death, is worthy of him. On the appearance of that officer, he addressed him thus: "Mr. Lieutenant, you have shew'd "both to me and my men very hard measure." "Wherin, my "lord?" quoth he. "Nay," said the earl, "I will not make a re-"capitulation of any thing, for it is all freely forgiven. Only I am "to say unto you a few words of my last will, which being observed, "may, by the grace of God, turn much to your benefit and reputa-"tion. I speak not for myself, for God of his goodness has taken "order that I shall be delivered very shortly out of your charge; "only for others I speak, who may be committed to this place. "You must think, Mr. Lieutenant, that when a prisoner comes "hither to this Tower, that he bringeth sorrow with him. Oh, then, "do not add affliction to affliction: there is no man whatsoever "that thinketh himself to stand surest, but may fall. It is a very "inhuman part to tread on him, whom misfortune hath cast down. "The man that is void of mercy God hath in great detestation. "Your commission is only to keep with safety, not to kill with "severity. Remember, good Mr. Lieutenant, that God, who with "his finger turneth the unstable wheel of this variable world, can in "the revolution of a few days bring you to be a prisoner also, and "to be kept in the same place, where you now keep others. There "is no calamity that men are subject unto, but you may also taste "as well as any other man. Farewell, Mr. Lieutenant; for the "time of my smal abode here come to me whenever you please, and "you shall be heartily welcome as my friend."—MS. Life of Philippe Howarde.

His interment in the Tower was conducted with a due regard to economy. His coffin cost the queen 10s., the black cloth which covered it 30s. As he was a Catholic, the chaplain deemed it a profanation to read the established service over the grave; and therefore began thus: "Wee are not come to honour this man's religion, "we publickely professe, and here openlie proteste, otherwyse to be

"saved; nor to honour his offence, the lawe hath judged him, wee "leave him to the Lord. He is gone to his place. Thus we find it "true, that is sette downe in our owne booke, 'Man that is born of a "'woman,' &c. Thus God hath laid this man's honour in the "dust. Yet as it is said in the Scriptures, 'Go, and bury yonder "'woman, for she is a king's daughter,' so we commit his bodie to "the earth, yet giving God hearty thanks that hath delyvered us of "so greate a feare. And thus let us praise God with the song of "Deborah." This was followed by the forty-ninth Psalm, and the service was concluded with a prayer composed for the occasion. "Oh! Almighty God! who art the judge of all the world, the lord "of lyfe and death, who alone hast the keys of the grave, who "shuttest and no man openeth it, who openest and no man can "shut, wee give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee in "thy mercy to us, to take this man out of this world: wee leave him "to thy majesty, knowing by the worde, that hee and all other shall "reyse again to give an account of all that has been done in the "fleshe, be it good or evyll, against God or man."—Dallaway's Western Sussex, ii. 145. MSS. Lansdowne, vol. 79, No. 34.

NOTE Z, p. 528.

That the reader may form a notion of the manner in which the Catholic gentlemen were treated during this reign, I have collected the following brief account of the fines paid, and the privations suffered by one of the first recusants convict, Edward Sulyard, esq. of Wetherden, in the county of Suffolk, from papers furnished by his descendant, the late Lady Stafford.

In 1586 the queen, finding that many of the recusants were unable to pay the full amount of the fines, to which they were liable by statute, consented to grant them some indulgence, on condition that they should pay an annual composition. By Mr. Sulyard, 40*l.* per annum was offered. I know not what sum was accepted; but he received permission to remain at his own house, under a protection from secretary Walsingham, forbidding him to be molested, "he "having bene a long tyme restrayned of his libertie for matter of "religion."

It appears that the fines due from him to the queen, "eo quod "ipse non adivit (Anglice, did not repair) ad aliquam ecclesiam, "capellam sive locum usualem communis precationis per spatium "69 mensium," amounted to 1,380*l.* of which he had paid only 540*l.* For the payment of the remaining 840*l.* within the space of three years, he found two sureties, Thomas Tyrrel and Edward Sulyard of Fenning, esqrs.

On the approach of the armada he was thrown into prison, together with other recusants; but having, in November, 1588, subscribed a declaration, that the queen was his lawful sovereign notwithstanding any excommunication whatsoever, and that he

would be always ready to defend her with his life and goods against the force of any prince, pope, potentate, prelate, or whatsoever other her enemy, he obtained leave to go to his estate, for the purpose of raising money, but on condition that he should repair to London against the 10th of March, and be confined in a private house. He obeyed, and was bound in a penalty of 2,000*l.* not to depart out of the house, or the appurtenances thereof.

In October, 1591, he obtained the liberty of walking out, having first bound himself under the same penalty, 1. Not to go beyond the sea, or more than six miles from the place of his confinement; and 2. To present himself before the council, within ten days, whenever notice should be left for that purpose at the house aforesaid, "until "he should have conformed and yielded himself unto the order for "religion, and for coming and resorting to divine service established "by act of parliament."

In 1594, on a rumour of invasion, he was confined with other recusants in the castle of Ely. In autumn leave was given him to go to his own house for fourteen days; and afterwards to choose the house of some friend, where he might be confined under the usual restrictions and penalties.

In 1595 he procured the indulgence of having his own house for his prison; and in 1598 was permitted to leave it for the space of six weeks.

In 1599, on another rumour of invasion, he was again confined in the castle of Ely; but, as soon as the danger was over, he returned to his own house, having first paid the expenses of his imprisonment in Ely. The next year he obtained another leave of absence for six weeks.

During this time, besides the composition to the queen, he was occasionally compelled by privy seals to lend money which was never repaid; occasionally to find a trooper fully equipped for the queen's service; and often to appear in person before the council or the archbishop.

To Mr. Sulyard I may add, as another instance, Mr. Towneley of Towneley, in Lancashire. The following inscription was placed by his order under his picture, which is still preserved in the portrait gallery at Towneley. "This John about the sixth or seventh year "of her Majesty's reign that now is, for professing the Apostolick "Roman Catholick ffaith was imprisoned first at Chester Castle; "then sent to the Marshalsea; then to York Castle; then "to the Blockhouses in Hull; then to the Gatehouse in West-"minster; then to Manchester; then to Broughton in Oxfordshire; "then twice to Ely in Cambridgeshire; and so now seventy-three "years old, and blind, is bound to appear and keep within five miles "of Towneley his house. Who hath, since the statute of the "twenty-third, paid into the Exchequer twenty pounds a month, "and doth still, so that there is paid already above ffive thousand "pounds. An. Dni. One thousand six hundred and one. John "Towneley of Towneley in Lancashire."

Such was the harassing and degrading life which every gentle-

man, known to be a Catholic, was compelled to lead, for the sole offence of *not conforming* to a worship which was contrary to his conscience; but if, in addition, he presumed to practise his own religion, if he heard mass, or received a priest into his house, he was subject to more rigorous fines, to forfeiture, to imprisonment for life, or to death, as a felon without benefit of clergy, according to the nature of the offence, and the statute under which he might be indicted.

NOTE AA, p. 530.

On the 18th of October, 1591, the queen issued a proclamation, distinguished by the violence of its language, against the king of Spain, the pope, and the missionaries, ordering all householders to make returns of every person who had resorted to their houses during the last twelve months, and to specify whether they knew any one who was accustomed to absent himself from the established service. To the proclamation were appended instructions for certain commissioners, appointed in each county, to receive these returns, and to discover, by all the means in their power, missionaries, or persons withdrawn from their allegiance by the arts of the missionaries.

There was much to reprehend in the scurrilous language of this instrument; and several passages in it appeared to call for an answer from the leaders of the Spanish party among the exiles. Two were soon published: one by Persons under the title of Responsio ad edictum, for an accurate account of which I shall refer the reader to Mr. Butler's Memoirs, iii. 236; and another by F. Cresswell, intituled Exemplar literarum missarum è Germania ad D. Gulielmum Cecilium, consiliarium regium. Impressum Anno Domini MDXCIJ.

In this tract the writer describes the persecution which the English Catholics suffered; and asserts that the author of the proclamation, in order to justify such barbarities, had recourse to calumny like the pagans of old. He enumerates the offences of Elizabeth; her ingratitude to the king of Spain, to whom she was formerly indebted for her life; the murder of the queen of Scots; her connections with the rebels of other monarchs, and her friendship with the Turk. To her character he opposes, in praise of Philip, his royal virtues, the use he makes of his power, his affection for the English exiles, and his labours to preserve the Catholic religion in England by the foundation of seminaries. The author next maintains the right of the pope to employ the arms of Catholic princes, and to depose apostate sovereigns, for the benefit of religion; and contends that, if he appointed Allen his legate, and ordered certain priests to attend the invading army under the duke of Parma, it was not to promote the destruction but the salvation of the country, to

diminish the horrors of war, and to protect Englishmen from the swords of the invaders. He boasts of the superior force of the Spanish king, and maintains that in the time of danger Elizabeth and her ministers will find that she possesses not the affection of the nation, and that her own soldiers will turn their arms against her.

It is difficult to speak of these tracts with the severity which they deserve. They might please the king of Spain, and might uphold his hope of effecting the conquest of England; but they were calculated to irritate Elizabeth, to throw suspicion on the loyalty of the Catholics, and to increase the pressure of persecution. The real motive of the authors may perhaps be discovered from the conclusion of each tract. They seem to have believed that the queen was alarmed, and they hoped, by adding to that alarm, to extort her assent to the following proposals: that she should make peace with Philip, should tolerate the exercise of the Catholic worship, and should allow all men, without distinction of religion, to partake of the favours and protection of government.—See Responsio, p. 247; Exemplar literarum, 179.

NOTE BB, p. 552.

I have seen many of these prints, and among them one calculated to excite feelings of the strongest abhorrence. It represents the execution of Margaret Middleton, the wife of Clitheroe, a rich citizen of York, who, for standing mute, suffered the peine forte et dure. She had harboured a priest in quality of a schoolmaster; and at the bar refused to plead guilty, because she knew that no sufficient proof could be brought against her, or not guilty, because she deemed such a plea equivalent to a falsehood.

As this barbarous mode of punishment is now grown obsolete, I shall describe her death in the words of one who was present in York at the time.

"The place of execution was the tolboth, six or seven yards from "the prison. After she had prayed, Fawcet (one of the sheriffs) "commanded them to put off her apparel; when she, with the four "women, requested him, on their knees, that for the honour of "womanhood, this might be dispensed with. But they would not "grant it. Then she requested them that the women might un- "apparel her, and that they would turne their faces from her during "that time.

"The women took off her clothes, and put upon her the long 'linen habit. Then very quietly she laied her down upon the "ground, her face covered with a handkerchief, and most part of "her body with the habit. The dore was laied upon her: her "hands she joined towards her face. Then the sheriff saied, 'Naie, "'ye must have your hands bound.' Then two serieants parted

"her hands, and bound them to two posts. (In the print her feet "are bound to two others.) After this they laied weight upon her, "which, when she first felt, she said, 'Jesu, Jesu, Jesu, have "'mercye upon mee;' which were the last words she was heard to "speake. She was in dying about one quarter of an hower. A "sharp stone, as much as a man's fist, had been put under her "back; upon her was laied to the quantitie of seven or eight hun-"dred weight, which, breaking her ribbs, caused them to burst "forth of the skinne."—March 25, 1586.

NOTE CC, p. 582.

If Titus Oates had never existed, the history of this ridiculous plot would suffice to show how easily the most absurd fictions obtain credit, when the public mind is under the influence of religious prejudice. The poison, it was said, was contained in a double bladder, which Squires was to prick with a pin, and then to press on the pommel of the saddle. The queen would undoubtedly touch it with her hand, and afterwards move her hand to her mouth or nose. In either case death must ensue, as the poison was of so subtile and penetrating a nature that it would instantly reach either her lungs or stomach.

To the account published by the government, Walpole himself opposed another in a pamphlet entitled, "The discoverie and con-"futation of a tragical fiction devysed and played by Ed. Squyer, "yeoman, soldiar, hanged at Tyburne the 23rd of Nov., 1598. "—Written for the only love and zeal of truth against forgerie, "by M. A. priest, that knew and dealt with Squyer in Spaine. "MDXCIX."

Both agree that Squires was a soldier under Drake, taken prisoner in the West Indies, and carried to Seville in Spain. There, by the government account, Walpole caused him to be put into the Inquisition, then prevailed on him to become a Catholic, and, having sworn him to kill the queen, procured him and one Rolles to be exchanged for two Spanish prisoners from England. The poison of course failed; but how came the attempt to be discovered? This is the most clumsy part of the story. Walpole, finding that the queen was still alive, through revenge for the supposed infidelity of Squires, sent Stanley from Spain to reveal his guilt to the council! "Be-"cause nothing succeeded of it, the priest, thinking he had either "changed his purpose or betrayed it, gave Stanley instructions to "accuse him; thereby to get him more credit, and to be revenged "of Squire for breaking promise. The fellow confessed the whole "practise, and, as it seemed, died very penitent."—Chamberlain (3 October, 1598) in Bacon's Works, vol. vi. pp. 41, 42, note, edition of 1803.

According to Walpole, Squires, for his misconduct at Seville, was

condemned to two years' imprisonment in a convent of Carmelite Friars; there, hoping to shorten the term of his punishment, he sent for Walpole, and pretended to become a Catholic; but finding this expedient of no avail, he broke out of his prison, reached St. Lucar, and got on board of a ship about to sail for England. Walpole solemnly asserts that he never gave him any poison, nor ever spoke to him about the murder of the queen. He always suspected his sincerity, and on that account refused to give him a letter of recommendation to any English Catholic. Indeed, so little was Walpole known either to Squires, or to Stanley, the pretended messenger, that neither of them could inform the council of his Christian name. They were compelled to guess at it, and in the indictment and pleadings called him William instead of Richard. "This world," he concludes, "is now grown over well acquainted "with the tales of queen-killing, as also that these bruites are "inductions to the killing of such innocent servants of God, as light "into the hands and power of the bloodthirsty" (p. 14.) Dated Rome, 1st March, 1599.

NOTE DD, p. 612.

I add the following graphic description of the surrender of Essex House, from a paper in the handwriting of Frances Bourchier, probably daughter of William earl of Bath. The original is in the possession of Sir Bourchier Wrey.

"About 6 of the cloke, the lo. admirall sent Sir Robert Sidney "to somone the earles, and those that weare with them, to yield "themselves, and, after the drume had somoned a parley, the earl of "Southamton came upon the leads, and asked S^r^ Robert Sidney, "calling him cossen Sidney, 'What would you have?' Who an-"swered that he somoned them for my lo. admirall, her ma^ties.^ "lieuftent generall, to yeeld themselves. Southamton replied, "'Dear cossen, to whom would you have us yeeld? To our "'enimies? That weare to thrust ōselves into perill willingly.' "'No,' said Sidney, 'but you must yeeld y^r^selves to her ma^tie.^' "'That would we willingly,' answered Southamton, 'but that "'therby we should confess ourselves guilty before we have "'offended: yet, if my lo. admirall will yeeld honorable hostages "'for our safe retorne to this place, we will goe and present our-"'selves before her ma^tie.^ to whom (God knoweth) we never in-"'tended the leaste hurte; whose royall disposition we know to be "'such that, if we might but freely declare our mindes, she would "'pardon us, and blame those that are blameworthy, those atheists "'and caterpillers I mean, who laid plots to bereave us of our lives, "'for safgard whereof we have, as the law of nature requiers us, "'taken up thes sodaine armes, though we do and will acknowledge "'all dutie and obeydience to her ma^tie.^ to our lives end.' *Sidenay.*

"'My lord, you must not capitulate with the prince. I know my "'lo. admiral will not yeeld to any such conditions of hostages.'

"*Southamton.* 'Good cossen, I do not capitulate with my prince. "'I do but a littell expostulate with you. You are a man of "'arms, and I know well what beloungs therto. You know by "'nature wee ar bound to defend ourselves against our equals, "'much mor against our inferiores: and, cossen, you cannot but "'know, or at leastwise conjecture that, if we should yeeld, we "'should willingly put ourselves into our enimies daunger, into the "'wolves mouth, into ther hands that would keep us far enough "'from coming to her ma^tie. to speak for ourselves: or, if we "'wear permitted, yet coming before her as captives, the lies of our "'enemies would overbalance our truthes. Then, good cossen, "'what would you do, if you wear in our cases?'

"*Sidney.* 'Good my lord, put no questions. I hould you wear "'best to yeeld; for this house, you know, is of no such force as it "'can long preserve you; and my lo. admirall hath already sent "'for powder and shott for battrie; and, if that prevailles not, he "'meanes to blow it up, and then ther is no way but one.'

"*Southamton.* 'Let his lordship do his pleasure: if he blow "'us up we shall be the nearer heaven. Wee purpose not to "'yeeld without hostages, for we have made choise rather to die "'like men with our swordes in our hands, than some 9 or 10 days "'hence to end our lives on a scaffold.'

"Then came the earl of Essex to Southamton, and said to S^r "Robert Sidney; 'Good brother Sidney, and you my loving coun- "'trymen (meaning the soldiours), nothing doth so much greeve "'me as that you, who, my conscience telleth me, love me, and for "'whose safety I have so often oposed myself to perill, that you I "'say, my friends, whose least drope of blod would exceedingly "'greeve me, should now be made agents against me, who would "'rather flinge myself headlounge from hence than that the meanest "'of you should be indangered: and those atheistes, mine enimies, "'keep aloof off from perill, and dare not once approche me: in "'fighting against whom if I might end my life, I would think my "'death most honourable, if by my death I might also end their lives, "'and that I had done to my prince and country good service by "'rooting out such caterpillars from the earth.'

"*Sidney.* 'I hope, my lo., you do not mean my lo. admirall.'

"*Essex.* 'God knowes him to be as honorable in mind, as he is in "'birthe, though ther hath bene some publike jarres, which I know "'on his parte cam rather by others provocation than any way of "'his own disposition. But I mean of more base condition, tho' in "'greater favour with her ma^tie. who have laid secrett plots and "'damnable devises to bereave me of my life, from which purpose "'my conscience tells me my lo. admirall is free. Yet, good "'brother, if I yeeld not, excuse me. For I will stand to my lo. "'Southamton his resolutione. As for my life, I hav it: and I hav "'thought it one of the greatest punishments that ever God laid "'upon me, to suffer me to escape the daunger of my last great

"'sicknes: for juge you, brother, whether it be a greefe or no to a "'man disended as I am, who have lived in accompt with her ma^tie. "'as I hav done, to be pined up so loung without any just cause, "'and to be trodden under foote of every base upstarte; yea, and "'more than that, to have my life so narrowly sought by them. "'Would it not greeve you? Yes, yes, I am sure it would. Well; "'it is no matter: death will end all: and death shall be most "'welcome: and, since I must die, and they enjoie their desire, I "'will die so honorably as I may. So, good brother, inform my "'lo. admirall.'

"*Sidney.* 'Well, my lord, I will return answer to his lordship.' "—After the drum had sounded a second parley, he delivered "the answer to lo. Southamton in this sorte. 'My lo. admirall "'will grant no hostages: but because he understands the ladies "'be in the house with you, to the end the inocent may not perishe "'with the guilty, he willeth you to send them forth, and they "'shall be safely and honorably conveied to som other place, wher "'they best like of.'

"*Southamton.* 'We thank his lordship for his honorable care of "'our ladies, which sheweth him to be honorably descended; but "'we desire him to pardon us in this case; for we prefere our own "'safty before ther liberty. Wee have now fortified our doores, "'which stood us in a good while's worke, and if we should un-"'fortifie them for our ladies, we should make open passage for "'our enimies. But if my lo. admirall will grant us an hower's "'space to open them for our ladies passages, and another hower "'after they be gone, with promise upon his honour not to make "'any attempt upon us in the meane time, then will we willingly "'suffer our ladies to departe.'

"Sidney returned with this answer to my lo. admirall, who "yeelded to them therein, and by this tim, which was about nine of "the cloke, was store of powder, shott, and ordinance brought from "the Tower to batter the house; but when Sidney brought word "back to them that they should have ther two hours, and tould them "besides of the provisione for battry of the house, the earl of Essex "requested a time of resolution which was granted; and, after they "had awhile consulted, the earl of Essex told Sidney that they "would yield on thes conditions; first, that they might be used like "honorable prisoners: secondly, that my lo. admiral would promise "to make faithful relatione to her ma^tie. of whatever they should say "for themselves in their own defence: thirdly, that they should have "an honorable and just triall: lastly, that, during the tim of ther "imprisonment, they might have such devines for their soules health, "as wear able to instruct them in matter of religione. These conditions "my lo. admirall graunted, and promised on his honor and salvation "to see them performed. Wherupon they went down, and opened "the doors; and eche of them upon his knee surrendered his sword. "The earl of Essex desired that her ma^tie. would inflict all the tor-"ments upon him that could be invented, so that the punishment of "the rest might be diminished, who entered into the action with

"him, som for friendship, som for kindred, some for affection, and "others as servants to their maisters. The earl of Southampton "requested the thinges doubtfully said or done, might be constered "to the best waye, which the lo. admirall said should be done. So "from thence they went to the places of their severall comitt-"ments.

"by me,
"FRANCES BOURCHIER."

NOTE EE, p. 660.

Though it was frequently reported that the queen had borne children to Leicester, the only individual known to have appeared publicly in that character was an Englishman at Madrid, who assumed the name of Arthur Dudley. Mr. Ellis has published a letter about him from an English spy to Lord Burghley, written on May 28, 1588.—Ellis, 2nd Ser. iii. 136. I may add a few more particulars, gleaned from the documents preserved at Simancas.

This adventurer arrived at Madrid about the end of 1586, and pretended that he was going to perform a vow at Monserrate; but some jealousy was excited respecting him by his frequent visits to the French ambassador. When the news arrived of the execution of Mary queen of Scots, he disappeared, but was taken at Pasage, as he attempted to escape to a ship at a small distance from that port. In consequence of his answers before the governor of Guispuscoa, he was sent to Madrid, where he received an order to write an account of himself in English. On the 17th of June, 1587, this memoir was translated into Spanish by Sir Francis Englefield, who informed Philip that it contained "el discorso de su education, y los argu-"mentos, y razones que lo han enducido a tenerse y llamarse hijo "de la reyna." The English original cannot be found, but the Spanish translation states that he (Arthur Dudley) is the reputed son of Robert Sotheron, once a servant of Mrs. Ashley, residing at Evesham, in Worcestershire. By order of Mrs. Ashley, Sotheron went to Hampton Court, where he was met by N. Haryngton, and told by her that a lady at court had been delivered of a child, that the queen was desirous to conceal her dishonour, and that Mrs. Ashley wished him to provide a nurse for it, and to take it under his care. Being led into the gallery near the royal closet, he received the infant from her with directions to call it Arthur, intrusted it to the wife of the miller at Moulsey on the opposite bank of the Thames, and afterwards conveyed it to his own house. Some years later Sotheron conducted the boy to a school in London: thence he was sent to travel on the continent, and in 1583 he returned to his reputed father at Evesham. He now concluded that there was some

mystery respecting his birth, from the different manner in which he and his supposed brothers and sisters had been educated, but could not draw the secret from Sotheron till a few days before the old man's death; when he learned from him that he was the son of Queen Elizabeth and of the earl of Leicester. He then consulted Sir John Ashley and Sir Drew Drury, who advised him to keep it secret, and to return to the continent. This he had done; but not before he had obtained an interview with the secretary of Leicester, and afterwards with Leicester himself. What passed between him and Leicester is not stated; but that Philip did not consider him an impostor, appears from this, that we find him, even a year after his apprehension, treated as a person of distinction, being "very solemnly warded and served, with an expense to the king "of vi crownes (almost 2*l.*) a daye. He was of xxvii yeares of age "or thereabout."—Ellis, ibid.

WWARCHTIW

END OF VOL. VI.

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
DA30.L71912 C001 V006
THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND NEW YORK
3 0311 00057 6459

27680

WITHDRAWN

DA 27680 Vol.6.
30
.L7 Lingard, John.
AUTHOR
1912 THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND.
TITLE

942 L 755h v.6

~~STUDENTS' LIBRARY~~ ~~585~~

BEFORE TAKING BOOK

from library, remove slip from this pocket; put your name and date on it and place it in the box provided for the same.

WHEN RETURNING BOOK

return the slip to the pocket and replace the book in its proper place.

A BOOK IS NO GOOD UNLESS YOU CAN FIND IT WHEN YOU NEED IT.

Your cooperation in keeping an orderly library will enable you to get the best service possible from your library.

3 0311 00057 6459